

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

OXFORD
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

Price 11s. 6d. net. Yearly subscription 35s. net, post free. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 60s. net, post free

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

Editors C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

New Series

Volume VII, No. 2

June 1957

CONTENTS

Euripidea	P. H. J. LLOYD-JONES 97
<i>Tò Μηδικόν</i> and <i>Tà Μηδικά</i>	N. G. L. HAMMOND 100
Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i> v. 315 ff.	F. H. SANDBACH 102
Notes on Valerius Flaccus	J. D. P. BOLTON 104
Aristarchus' 'Τέλος' (<i>Od.</i> xxiii. 296)	F. L. KAY 106
The Spartan Embassy to Athens (408/7 B.C.)	H. W. PARKE 106
[Moschus], iii. 37	C. A. TRYPANIS 107
Horace, <i>Sat.</i> i. 6. 104-5	W. D. ASHWORTH, M. ANDREWES 107
The Senator's Retiring Age	D. McALINDON 108

REVIEWS:

Pindare, poète et prophète (Duchemin), D. S. ROBERTSON, 109; *Greek Theatre Production* (Webster), P. H. J. LLOYD-JONES, 111; *Protagora* (Capizzi), G. S. KIRK, 114; *Griechische Vers-Inscripfen* (Peck), A. G. WOODHEAD, 115; *Studien zur griechischen Biographie* (Dihle), H. D. WESTLAKE, 118; *Terenz und Menander* (Straus), G. W. WILLIAMS, 120; *Propertiana* (Shackleton Bailey), E. A. BARBER, 122; *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris* (Salvatore), E. J. KENNEY, 124; *Fedro* (de Lorenzi), W. S. MAGUINNESS, 125; *Caesar as Man of Letters* (Adcock), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 127; *Caesar, Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars* (Way), G. C. WHITTICK, 128; *Columella* (Forster and Heffner), *Columellae libri viii-ix* (Josephson), *Die Columella-Handschriften* (Josephson), C. J. FORDYCE, 130; *The Greek Dialects* (Buck), D. M. JONES, 132; *Studies on the Greek Superlative* (Thesleff), H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS, 135; *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* xi. 2, xii, xiii (Hondius, Woodhead), P. M. FRASER, 136; *Die besten Kulturen Griechenlands* (Schachermeyr), F. H. STUBBINGS, 139; *The Greek Grants* (Andrewes), R. M. COOK, 141; *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Amicitia* (von Fritz), R. J. HOPPER, 143; *A History of Roman Sea-Power* (Thiel), *The Boarding-Bridge of the Romans* (Wallinga), H. H. SCULLARD, 144; *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army* (Suolahti), P. J. CUFF, 147; *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire* (Boak), B. H. WARMINGTON, 149; *Livia's Garden Room* (Gabriel), W. H. PLOMMER, 151; *The Shrine of St. Peter* (Toynbee and Ward Perkins), 152; *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici* (Momigliano), R. J. HOPPER, 154; *The Classics and Renaissance Thought* (Kristeller), R. R. BOLGAR, 156.

[Continued on p. 3 of cover

The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME VII NO. 2

(VOLUME LXXI OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

June 1957

EURIPIDEA¹

1. *Ion* 237-8:

"*Ἰων. γενναϊότης σοι, καὶ τρόπων τεκμήριον
τὸ σχῆμ' ἔχεις τόδ', ἥτις εἰ ποτ', ὦ γύναι.*

Wilamowitz thought the text was sound. He quotes *Ph.* 1680:

γενναϊότης σοι, μωρία δ' ἔνεστί τις

and argues that in the *Ion* passage the speaker starts as though he is going to use a similar expression and then changes his mind. But the switch from one construction to another is too violent for this writer; and it is odd that the temple slave should address the queen in so abrupt a fashion. Several conjectures have been offered; *γενναῖος εἰ τις* by Dobree, *γενναία τις σύ* by Reiske, *γενναία τοι σύ* by Musgrave, *γενναϊότητος* by Boissonade, *γενναϊότητος τῶν τρόπων* by Badham. It is plain that none of these will do.

It is strange that no one has yet suggested that there may be something missing at the beginning of the speech. This assumption would explain both the harshness of the syntax and the abruptness of the sense, so much at variance with the ceremonious addresses to royal ladies which abound in tragedy. How much is missing or what that was is of course impossible to guess. But I suspect that not more than one line has dropped out, and that it was something like this:

ὦ χαῖρ', ἀνασσα· καὶ γὰρ οὖν μορφῇ τ' ἐνὶ . . .

Compare *Soph. El.* 663-4. The Paedagogus asks the Chorus if he is right in identifying the lady whom he sees as Clytemnestra: *πρέπει γὰρ ὡς τύραννος εἰσορᾶν*. When the Chorus has confirmed his guess, he begins: *ὦ χαῖρ', ἀνασσα*.

2. *Orestes* 1621-4:

*Μενέλαος. ὦ γαῖα Δαναῶν ἱππίου τ' Ἀργεῖος κτίται,
οὐκ εἴ' ἐνόπλῳ ποδὶ βοηδρομήσετε;
πᾶσαν γὰρ ἡμῶν δδε βιάζεται πόλιν
ζῆν, αἶμα μητρὸς μυσαρὸν ἐξειργασμένος.*

1623 *ἡμῶν* codd. (Editors print Brunck's *ὑμῶν*; but why should not Menelaus for the moment count himself as an Argive?)

The second sentence is supposed to mean: 'For this man is constraining your whole city so that he may live, having on his hands the pollution of his mother's blood'.

βιάζεσθαι is often followed by an infinitive. But the analogy of every other

¹ I am grateful to Professor D. L. Page for his criticism of these notes.

instance suggests that these words ought properly to mean: 'This man is constraining your whole city to live'; and this is nonsense.

Nauck changed ζῆν to ζῆ δ': but there is a better remedy. The scholia offer two different explanations of the passage. The second is the one given by modern editors; but the first runs: *πάσαν γὰρ ὁμῶν οὗτος πόλιν βιάζεται διὰ τὸ ζῆν καὶ αὐτόν, μηδενὸς αὐτῷ συγχωροῦντος*. No one seems to have observed that the writer of this note must have read ζῶν, which I think is the right reading. The sentence will then have meant: 'For this man is committing an act of violence against your city by his very being alive . . .', etc.

The corruption postulated is a very easy one, since βιάζεσθαι is so often followed by an infinitive that the participle may easily have been altered. The sense given is more forceful than that which we get from reading ζῆν; one point in its favour is that it makes it easier to see why *πάσαν* is there. Compare *Septem* 1042:

αὐδῶ πόλιν σε μὴ βιάζεσθαι τόδε,

the use of νόμους βιάζεσθαι at *Soph. Ant.* 663 and *Thuc.* viii. 53. 2, and *Theocr.* 22. 9, where Gow renders *ἄσπρα βιαζόμενοι* by 'wilfully disregarding the prognostics of the heavens'. In the *Orestes* passage also, 'do violence to' is a stronger equivalent of 'wilfully disregard'.

3. *Phoenissae* 582-3:

Ἰοκάστη.

δύο κακῷ σπεύδεις, τέκνον,
κείνων στέρεσθαι τῶνδ' ἐπ' ἐν μέσῳ πεσεῖν.

Σ ὁ δὲ νοῦς· μήτε ἐκεῖνα μήτε ταῦτα ἔχειν. καὶ κείνων στερηθῆναι τούτων τε μὴ τυχεῖν. τὸ γὰρ ἐν μέσῳ πεσεῖν οὕτως φησί· πρὸ τοῦ ἀφικέσθαι ἐπ' αὐτὰ ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς ἐλπίδος. (MTAB).

This view has been accepted by most editors; Pearson, for instance, writes: 'to lose Argos and to fall short of Thebes'. 'With ἐν μέσῳ, μεταξύ and the like', Pearson says, 'whether referring to space or time, only one limit is expressed in Greek'. He cites *Ar. Av.* 187:

ἀλλ' ἐν μέσῳ δῆπουθεν ἀήρ ἐστι γῆς

where the meaning is 'between (the gods and) the earth is the air'.

Pearson takes κείνων and τῶνδε as neuter, so that they are equivalent to τὰ ἐν Ἀργεῖ and τὰ ἐν Θήβαις meaning 'what you have in Argos' and 'what you have in Thebes'. It follows that he has to take ἐν μέσῳ πεσεῖν as meaning 'fall short of' in the sense of 'lose'. The trouble is that neither ἐν μέσῳ nor μεταξύ is ever coupled with πεσεῖν or any other verb in quite this sense. They never seem to be used as 'citra' is in Ovid's 'citraque necem tua constitit ira' (*Tr.* ii. 127) or as 'this side' is used in Jonson's famous saying about Shakespeare. Grégoire and Parmentier translate 'perdre Argos et tomber avant d'atteindre Thèbes'. They seem to take the last words literally, as meaning 'be killed before reaching Thebes'. But Pearson must be right in taking both the pronouns to be neuter.

Powell offers a third way of taking the passage. 'If you are conquered', he paraphrases, 'you will lose the one advantage—the friendship of Argos; if you conquer, in the hour of success you will fail (for a victory over one's country is a loss)'. Powell has not seen that this sentence must sum up, not the whole of Iocaste's address to Polyneices (568-83), but the second half of it (578-83). The first half of her address envisages the consequences of an Argive victory, the second half those of an Argive defeat. If Argos is defeated, Polyneices will

incur a double penalty; not only will Thebes be lost to him, but his Argive friends will blame him for their calamity. It is this second half which 582-3 sum up; and there is no reason for thinking that τῶνδε . . . ἐν μέσῳ could mean 'in the hour of success' in this context. Pearson must be right in thinking that κείνων and τῶνδε are antithetical; and if κείνων means τῶν ἐν Ἀργεῖ, τῶνδε must mean τῶν ἐν Θήβαις. Powell seems to have changed his view later; for a note in his copy of Prinz-Wecklein, which I now possess, suggests that he later came to regard l. 583 as an interpolation.

I suspect that Euripides wrote:

δύο κακῷ σπεύδεις, τέκνον,
κείνων στέρεσθαι τῶνδ' ἐ', ἐν μέσῳ πεσών.

'You are bringing on yourself a double misfortune, my son, that of losing both what is yours in Argos and what is yours in Thebes, by falling between the two.'

Technically the emendation is an easy one. The text would obviously have been liable to corruption by someone who assumed that l. 583 consisted of two clauses coupled by the τε and that the second, like the first, ought to contain an infinitive.

Almost every modern language seems to have a proverb similar to our 'falling between two stools'; but I have found no exact equivalent in Greek or Latin. And yet the expression seems so natural and its meaning in this context so obvious that I believe Euripides used ἐν μέσῳ πεσών in this sense.

4. *Electra* 1058-9:

Ἦλ. † ἄρα κλυοῦσα, μήτηρ, εἴτ' ἔρξεις κακῶς;
Κλ. οὐκ ἔστι, τῇ σῇ δ' ἡδὺ προσθήσω φρενί.

If the text is right in l. 1059, the sense will be: 'Not so, but I will give pleasure to your heart.' But can it be right? Denniston justifies οὐκ ἔστι by quoting *Or.* 1097; but here and everywhere it means 'It cannot be', and it is much too solemn and categorical a pronouncement to suit this context. Denniston quotes *Soph. Ph.* 1020 and *Eur. fr.* 263 N.² to support the use of ἡδύ as equivalent to ἡδονή. The former passage runs ἀλλ' οὐ γὰρ οὐδέν θεοὶ νέμουνσιν ἡδύ μοι: the presence of οὐδέν destroys its value as evidence for the point in question. The fragment reads as follows:

ἔστι δὲ καὶ παρὰ δάκρυσι
κείμενον ἡδὺ βροτοῖς, ὅταν
ἄνδρα φίλον στενάχῃ τις ἐν οἴκῳ.

The text is clearly doubtful; and F. W. Schmidt (*Krit. Stud.* ii. 456) may be right in thinking that κείμενον has been transposed from the next clause. In any case the word is suspect, and the fragment cannot safely be used to support the alleged use of ἡδύ here.

John Jackson (*C.Q.* xxxv [1941], 31 = *Marginalia Scaenica*, 176) conjectured:

οὐκ εἴ τι σῇ τῇδ' ἡδὺ προσθήσω φρενί

'No, if I will be giving pleasure to your heart in this way.' This suggestion might possibly be right; but the sentence will run smoothly and the corruption be more easily explained if we read:

οὐκ, εἴ τι τῇ σῇ γ' ἡδὺ προσθήσω φρενί.

γε is often used with conditional sentences with this limiting force; see Denniston, *Greek Particles*, p. 142 for instances. For its occurrence in a

conditional clause limiting an answering negative in dialogue, compare Soph. *O.T.* 583:

οὐκ, εἰ δίδοις γ', ὡς ἐγώ, σαυτῷ λόγον.

It is of course very common for γε to stand after a pronoun or pronominal adjective. The sense given is well suited to the context: 'No, if I shall give pleasure to your heart in this way' (i.e. by permitting you to have your say).

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

τὸ Μηδικόν and τὰ Μηδικά

SOME commentators, including W. H. Forbes in his edition and A. W. Gomme in his *Commentary on Thucydides*, i. 175, have supposed that τὰ Μηδικά in Thucydides i. 41. 2 'may mean the war of 480-479 only, excluding Marathon'. It would, however, be extraordinary if any Greek, and especially any Athenian, excluded Marathon from τὰ Μηδικά to the chagrin of οἱ Μαραθωνομάχαι! It would be more extraordinary still if Thucydides, who saw the continuity between the Archidamian and the Decelean Wars, failed to see the continuity between the campaigns of Marathon and Salamis, with the history of Herodotus before him. If we attend to Thucydides' use of the phrase, this supposition falls to the ground. At i. 73. 2-4 the Athenian envoys say they must mention τὰ Μηδικά. They do not exclude Marathon but they include it: φάμεν γὰρ Μαραθῶνι τε . . . καὶ . . . ἐν Σαλαμῖνι. Nor is the case otherwise at i. 97. 2, where Thucydides remarks that his predecessors described ἡ τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικά . . . ἢ αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά. The division is too clear-cut for one to suppose that Marathon, where Hippas campaigned μετὰ Μήδων (vi. 59. 4), belonged to the former period and not to the latter. The conclusion seems to me certain that when Thucydides, who is his own best commentator in the matter, refers to τὰ Μηδικά, he means the campaigns of 490 to 479 B.C.

An author so precise as Thucydides is unlikely to change the meaning of the phrase τὰ Μηδικά. At i. 14. 2, where he dates an event ὀλίγον πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν, he refers as at i. 97. 2 to the period before Marathon. In this passage he is arguing that the Greek states were late in building fleets with large numbers of triremes (i. 14. 1 τριῆρσι μὲν ὀλίγαις χρώμενα: i. 14. 2 τριῆρεις . . . ἐς πλῆθος ἐγένοντο: i. 14. 3 ὅψέ τε ἀφ' οὗ Ἀθηναίους Θεμιστοκλῆς ἐπεισεν . . .). As he looks down the course of history he observes that the Sicilian tyrants and the Corcyraeans had a large number of triremes 'shortly before τὰ Μηδικά and (shortly before) the death of Darius, who succeeded Cambyses as King of Persia; for these were the last considerable fleets in Greece before Xerxes' campaign (ὀλίγον τε πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν καὶ τοῦ Δαρείου θανάτου . . . πρὸ τῆς Ξέρξου στρατείας). In terms of dates these fleets arose shortly before 490/89 and 486/5 and were the last considerable fleets before 480 B.C. In the same way we might say of tanks, that they did not appear until the World Wars, indeed until 1916, and only on a large scale in 1940. The importance of triremes probably became apparent in the 490's, when Corcyra intervened in Sicily, and developed in these areas before 480 B.C., when Herodotus attributes 200 triremes to Gelon and 60 triremes to Corcyra (vii. 158. 4; 168. 4). It may seem strange that Thucydides added the death of Darius; but in i. 13-14 he is using the Kings of Persia to date the growth of fleets (i. 13. 6 Cyrus and Cambyses and i. 14 Darius, successor of Cambyses, and Xerxes; cf. i. 16).

The phrase τὰ Μηδικά (like τὰ τε Κερκυραϊκά καὶ τὰ Ποτειδεατικά in i. 118. 1) stands for τὰ Μηδικὰ πράγματα, 'the Median affairs'. At i. 23. 1 τῶν δὲ πρότερον ἔργων μέγιστον ἐπράχθη τὸ Μηδικόν we supply with τὸ Μηδικόν the word ἔργον, which, as often in Thucydides, means 'action' (for ἔργον see i. 21. 2; i. 22. 2; ii. 7. 1; iii. 10. 2). 'The Median action' is, of course, different from 'the Median affairs' and also from 'the Median War' (ὁ Μηδικὸς πόλεμος i. 95. 7). At i. 23. 1 Thucydides is comparing actions of the past, not 'affairs' or 'wars' of the past. As he goes on to say, 'the Median action' was decided quickly by θυοῖν ναυμαχίαν καὶ πεζομαχίαν. There is no doubt, as the ancients saw,¹ that the quick decision of 'the Median action' was brought about by the naval battles of Artemisium and Salamis and by the land battles of Thermopylae and Plataea. Thucydides refers again to this decision at i. 89. 2: Μῆδοι ἀνεχώρησαν ἐκ τῆς Εὐρώπης νικηθέντες καὶ ναοὶ καὶ πεζῶ ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων. The battle of Mycale, which was fought rather on land than at sea (Hdt. ix. 98 f.), marked a new 'action', the liberation of Ionia (ix. 104 fin.). To this battle Thucydides referred after 'the retreat from Europe', καὶ οἱ καταφυγόντες αὐτῶν ταῖς ναυσὶν ἐς Μυκάλην διεφθάρησαν. In terms of 'actions', too, Marathon belonged to a different action (i. 18. 1; i. 73. 4; vii. 59. 4). Thus 'the Median action' is the campaign of Xerxes' forces in Europe. Their withdrawal marks its end. As such it is used by Thucydides as a dating point (i. 69. 1 μετὰ τὰ Μηδικά: i. 93. 8 μετὰ τὴν Μῆδων ἀναχώρησιν).

'The Median War', however, lasted longer than 'the Median action'. It is the war from which Sparta resigned in 478 B.C. (i. 95. 7; iii. 10. 2). Although the alliance of the Greeks against the Medes persisted until at least 461 B.C. (i. 102. 4), Thucydides put the end of 'the Median War' in 478 B.C.; thereafter he gave pride of place to the rise of Athens' power which filled the years between 478/7 (Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 23. 5) and 431 B.C. (i. 97. 1, μετὰ τὸ τοῦδε τοῦ πολέμου καὶ τοῦ Μηδικοῦ). Although he does not define the beginning of 'the Median War', it is clear that the war ὑπὸ Ἑλλήνων against the Medes began in 480 B.C., and it was in this war that the Spartans and their allies appreciated the naval strength and the daring of Athens (τοῦ τε ναυτικοῦ αὐτῶν τὸ πλῆθος, ὁ πρὶν οὐχ ὑπῆρχε, καὶ τὴν ἐς τὸν Μηδικὸν πόλεμον τόλμαν γενομένην, i. 90. 1).

If we follow Thucydides' own usage, the meaning of these terms is clear. 'The Median affairs', αὐτὰ τὰ Μηδικά in contrast to τὰ πρὸ τῶν Μηδικῶν Ἑλληνικά (i. 97. 2), contains no ambiguity but comprises Marathon and Plataea, i.e. 490-479 B.C. 'The Median action' consists of the Persian invasion and repulse from Europe, i.e. 480-479 B.C. And 'the Median war' waged 'by the Greeks' lasted effectively from 480 to 478 B.C. These conclusions may seem too obvious to merit any emphasis, but they have a bearing on the war between Athens and Aegina.² At i. 41. 2 the Corinthians refer to the warships they lent to Athens πρὸς τὸν Αἰγινητῶν ὑπὲρ τὰ Μηδικὰ πόλεμον. As this episode in the Aeginetan war preceded 'the Median affairs', it occurred before the latter part of 490 B.C.² Herodotus too (vi. 89-92) placed it at this time. The agreement of Thucydides with Herodotus lends further support to the dating of the Aeginetan war which I have advanced in *Historia* iv (1955), 406-11.

Clifton College, Bristol

N. G. L. HAMMOND

¹ Scholiast ad loc. and Plut., *De Herod. Malign* 43.

² Gomme, loc. cit., and Andrewes, *B.S.A.*

xxxvii (1936-7), 5, underestimate the importance of this passage and the preciseness of Thucydides' words.

VIRGIL, *AENEID* v. 315 ff.

haec ubi dicta locum capiunt signoque repente
 corripunt spatia audito limenque relinquunt
 effusi nimbo similes simul ultima signant
 primus abit longeque ante omnia corpora Nisus
 emicat . . .

THESE lines are thus deliberately transcribed without punctuation. The words *simul ultima signant* are said by Mackail to be unintelligible and, if authentic, a stopgap—a despairing but perhaps not a necessary conclusion.

It is true enough that no convincing interpretation is to be found in the editions. The traditionally accepted explanation is that of Servius Danielis: *intuentur (et notant) ultima spatia (id est finem cursus) aviditate vincendi. (et deest visu), ut (Cicero) 'notat et designat oculis'.*¹ He could have found a closer parallel in the *Aeneid* itself, xii. 3: *se signari oculis*; but the uncompounded verb, like Cicero's *designat*, means 'mark out, indicate', not merely 'look towards'. Possibly even closer is Plautus, *Cist.* 693 ff., quoted by Nettlehip: *HA. ad terram aspice et despice, oculis inuestiges, astute augura . . . PH. certe eccam: locum signa tibi ea exidit: apparet.* This may mean, however, 'she identifies' rather than 'she stares at' the spot, cf. *Aen.* ii. 423 *ora sono discordia signant*. These solitary examples will hardly show that it is possible to make *signo* mean 'strain the eyes upon', especially when the context, unlike the supposed parallels, does not contain the word *oculis*. Moreover Henry effectively criticizes the sense thus obtained. 'If *SIMUL*', he writes, 'be *they all at the same time*, there seems to be no good reason why they should all at the same time perform this act, especially as the act was one which could not be seen by the spectators . . . and if *SIMUL* be *at the same time as they RELINQUUNT LIMEN EFFUSI NIMBO SIMILES*, the running with eyes fixed intently on a distant goal and the rushing with the impetuosity of a shower agree but sorrily together.' With the words 'the act was one which could not be seen by the spectators' he lays his finger on a difficulty inherent in this interpretation: the simile *effusi nimbo similes*, whatever its exact force, is pictorial, and expresses what the spectators see: it will not cohere with something of which only the individual competitors are aware.

An alternative, put forward by Ti. Donatus, and favoured by Conington, is that as soon as the runners start, other persons mark out the finish: *designabant locum qui finem cursibus daret*. But no one will believe in a race that starts before the goal has been indicated.

Henry himself translated the words 'at the same time the last trumpets sound'. But although he can show that trumpets sometimes sounded thrice as a signal, he has no evidence that they ever did so to start a race, or that *signo* ever bears the sense 'give a signal'. These objections will also apply to Slater's suggestion, quoted by Mackail, that *simul* stands for *simulac* and that the meaning is 'as soon as the starters give the final signal, Nisus shoots away'. Moreover it is improbable that having sent his runners away Virgil should thus revert to the starting signal.

Nevertheless I believe that Slater was right in his interpretation of *simul*, and right in joining the clause with what follows, not with what precedes, wrong only in not giving *signo* its literal meaning, 'make an impress'. The word to be understood with it is not *oculis* but *pedibus*, and we should adduce Ovid, *Amores*

¹ In *Catilinam* i. 2. The words in brackets are added by a later hand in one manuscript.

ii. 11. 15, *litora marmoreis pedibus signate, puellae*; Horace, *A.P.* 159, *pede certo signat humum*; Statius, *Thebaid* iv. 257, *tenero signantem gramina passu*; *ibid.* vi. 904, *turpia signata linquens uestigia terra*; Silius iv. 147, *sonipes . . . uix summo uestigia puluere signat*; and further passages quoted below. This explanation is actually given as an alternative by Servius: *signant uestigiis ut alibi 'uix summa uestigia signat harena'*.¹ It may have been neglected because he combines it with an absurd explanation of *ultima*, viz. *signant ultima culmorum scilicet summitatem*. This may be due to a memory of the conventional hyperbole applied to Camilla in vii. 808: *illa uel intactae segetis per summa uolaret | gramina, nec teneras cursu laessisset aristas*. The true meaning of *ultima* is not the tops of the grass, but the last stretch of the course—*pars ultima cursus restabat*, as Ovid puts it in describing the race between Atalanta and Hippomenes (*Met.* x. 672).

Thus understanding the meaning and construction of *simul ultima signant*, we can appreciate the vividness of the narrative. The starting signal is given, and the runners are off, 'eating up' the course—*corripiunt spatia*—the starting line is left behind as they burst away like a storm-cloud. The comparison is not only with the swiftness of the storm sweeping over the countryside, but also with its compactness; the runners are in a tight bunch, like the *nimbus peditem* that follows Turnus (*Aen.* vii. 793-4: *agmina densentur campis*). But as soon as they begin to trample the last stretch, someone is seen to be in the lead, well ahead of the other unidentified competitors (*corpora*)—yes, it's Nisus, coming right away. Then it is seen that Silius is second, then Euryalus, Helymus, and right on his heels Dioreas, *spatia et si plura supersint, transeat elapsus*. But already *sub ipsam finem aduentant*. The incident of Dioreas shows that the opening out of the field takes place at the end, not the beginning of the race.

Races in ancient poets are usually so run that the winner only draws away towards the end. Virgil may have had in mind not only the foot-race in *Iliad* xxiii, but also the chariot-race:

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πύματον τέλεον δρόμον ὠκέες ἵπποι
ἄψ' ἐφ' ἁλὸς πολιῆς, τότε δὴ ἀρετὴ γε ἐκάστων
φαίνεται, ἄφαρ δ' ἵπποισι τάβη δρόμος· ὦκα δ' ἔπειτα
αἱ Φηρητιάδαο ποδάκεις ἐκφέρων ἵπποι.

The phrase ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πύματον τέλεον δρόμον recurs in the account of the foot-race, and again marks the critical point: up to then Odysseus has been so close to Ajax that he breathes upon his neck.² Virgil's foot-race is imitated by Silius xvi. 488 ff. Silius multiplies incident, and to give time for it his Eurytus has to lengthen his stride and draw away earlier than Nisus, namely *already* at the half-way point:

extulit incumbens medio iam limite gressum
Eurytus, et primus breuibibus, sed primus, abibat
praeceps spatii.

Silius also makes use of the word *signo*, but characteristically eliminates the somewhat forced Virgilian phrase in favour of the familiar hyperbole, *nullaque tramissa uestigia signat harena* (485).

Trinity College, Cambridge

F. H. SANDBACH

¹ Perhaps a conflation in Servius' memory of G. iii. 195, *uix summa uestigia ponat harena*, with G. iii. 171, *illis iam saepe rotae ducantur inanes per terram et summo uestigia puluere signant*. One may guess that Silius, quoted above, agreed with some outmoded editors

of Virgil in supposing a change of subject in the latter passage, so that the bullocks, not the wheels, mark the dust.

² So in Quintus Smyrnaeus iv. 195 ff. Teucer and Ajax run neck and neck until just before the end.

NOTES ON VALERIUS FLACCUS

(1) ii. 72

iamque sub Eoae dubios Atlantidis ignes
albet ager.

THE Argonauts' first dawn at sea. On the ground that Aurora is nowhere connected with Atlas Madvig (*Adversaria Critica*, ii. 136) ingeniously emended *Atlantidis* to *Pallantidis*. But the similarity of language with Virgil (*Geor.* i. 221 'ante tibi Eoae Atlantides abscondantur') admonishes circumspection before we change the text—*prima facie* at least: this very similarity could be adduced as an auxiliary cause of the corruption of *Pallantidis*, according to taste. Here I think caution is justified, and the assumption that Atlantis is antonomasia for Aurora ill founded: why should it not mean 'the Pleiads' (singular in Luc. v. 4 'gelidoque cadens Atlantis Olympo'), as Langen takes it? The Argonauts sailed at the beginning of summer, the time of the ἑώρα ἐπιτολή of the Pleiads, according to Theocritus (13. 25 ff. ἄμος δ' ἀντέλλοντι Πελειάδες, ἐσχατιαὶ δὲ ἄρνα νέον βόσκοντι, τετραμμένον εἶαρος ἤδη, κτλ.), whom Valerius may not imitate (A. Grueneberg, *De V. F. imitatore*, pp. 23 ff., 94) but may none the less have read: that is, when they first appear above the eastern horizon just before the sun—the one season of the year when a learned and ingenious poet could use them to denote the dawn. *Sub Atlantidis ignes* is of course an extension of the usage *sub lucem, sub noctem*, etc.; because of the added definition of *Eoae* (cf. *Geor.* i. 221 quoted above) less bold than Virgil's 'sub ipsum Arcturum' (*Geor.* i. 67 f.) or Lucan's 'ante Canis radios' (x. 226). I say this because the Loeb editor, unnecessarily and without notifying the reader, goes a step further than Madvig and prints 'sub dubio Pallantidis igne'.

Dubios may be a general epithet: the Pleiads are always dim (ἐπισκίασθαι ἀφ' αὐραὶ, Arat. *Phaen.* 256); but they would of course be even dimmer as the sky lightens at daybreak, so Langen may be right in seeing a particular point in Valerius' use of the adjective here.

(2) vi. 57 ff.

insuper auratos collegerat ipse dracones,
matris Horae specimen, linguisque adversus utrimque
congruit et tereti serpens dat vulnera gemmae.

Among those who come to do battle with Aeetes is the Scythian Colaxes, whose name recalls Colaxais in Hdt. iv. 5, and whose mother that ἐχιδνα διφνῆς μειξοπάρεβος of Hdt. iv. 9; but fathered by Jupiter, who felt no repulsion for the *gemini angues* of his bride (l. 52); and no wonder, for her serpentine legs denote her rank—she was no other than the Scythian Great Goddess (Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, pp. 73, 106–8). The troops of Colaxes bear the insignia of their leader's father, the thunderbolt, upon their shields. In addition (*insuper*, l. 57) Colaxes himself wears an emblem of his mother, two snakes, and this is here described in words recalling *Aen.* xii. 162–4. But both the sense and the tense of *collegerat* are difficult, while we look in vain for some information necessary to the context—where was this token displayed? Langen on *auratos collegerat ipse dracones* says 'verba obscure dicta quae illustrantur loco Verg. *geor.* ii 154 "squameus in spiram . . . se colligit anguis"; ex auro igitur fecerat Colaxes dracones spiris se colligentes ita, ut linguis adversis congruerent i.e. inter se tangerent' (they were embossed on the shield, I suppose). But even allowing the meaning thus stuffed into *collegerat*, the paratactic juxtaposition of the pluperfect and the vivid present jars; Valerius does it elsewhere (cf.

J. Samuelsson, *Studia in V.F.*, p. 10), but nowhere else quite as here: elsewhere the pluperfect is the paratactic equivalent of a subordinate verb in syntaxis—it could be replaced by a temporal clause without impairing the sense; here it is the main verb—*ipse collegerat* being the antithesis to *cuncta phalanx insigne Iovis . . . gestat*, l. 53 (this is brought out by Langen's paraphrase).

I am certain that *collegerat* conceals *collo gerit*, and that the emblem was a gold torque, a favourite ornament of northern barbarians. The bodies of the snakes encircle the wearer's neck, while in front their heads face each other across a gem. The sort of thing is well illustrated by Rostovtzeff (op. cit., plate xxiv) and Minns (*Scythians and Greeks*, p. 272 *al.*).

(3) viii. 159 'sum memor, ut tecum mecum partita laborem'.

In Book vi (427 ff.), to ensure success for Jason, Juno had planned to gain for him the love and magic arts of Medea, and had solicited the aid of Venus for this purpose. There she had deemed it prudent to conceal her real reason: the pretext for her request was marital coolness on the part of Jupiter. Venus, secretly undeceived, had nevertheless obliged with a loan of her cestus and the entire force of Cupids.

Results, however, had not been altogether satisfactory, and here Juno approaches Venus again, to report failure and to ask for further help. But now all pretence is laid aside, and she speaks frankly; in fact, she seems to have forgotten the little lie she told previously (an inconsistency noted also by Samuelsson, op. cit., p. 128): in spite of Venus' services in the task of conquering her love (the *labor* of l. 159), Medea (*illa*, l. 160) is obdurate.

Such should clearly be the sense of the passage, and Wagner's *sis hunc* for *tecum* here gets it, but is too difficult palaeographically to be likely. C's *totum mecum* is a patch, for it gives no indication of who the subject of *partita* is: this must be shown either by an auxiliary verb or by a personal pronoun. Madvig's text appears to have had a lacuna where *mecum* stands, which he fills with *sim tum*, ascribing the loss to similarity with *tecum* (*Adv. Crit.* ii. 149); but this would imply that *mecum* is an interpolation, which is most improbable: interpolators try to make sense, however lame, not nonsense, of their texts.

I suggest

sum memor, ut tu aequum mecum partita laborem.

The corruption could occur through the spelling *aecum*, a common enough variant (*T.L.L.* i. 1028, 80 ff.)—or even *ecum*?—especially if assisted by the swallowing of *tu* by *ut* (cf. Housman, *Manilius*, i, pp. lxiii, lxiv).

For the construction *aequum mecum* cf. Ter. *Eun.* 91 f. 'utinam esset mihi / pars aequa amoris tecum ac pariter fieret'. 'Aequum laborem partiti' (for 'aequas laboris partes suscipere') may find some parallel from Stat. *Theb.* vi. 118 f. 'iamque pari cumulo geminas, hanc tristibus umbris, / ast illam superis, aequus labor auxerat aras'; though here perhaps the sense of *aequus* is better rendered by 'impartial'. Virgil, *Geor.* iii. 118 'aequus uterque labor' is certainly different. For the omission of the auxiliary verb in the subjunctive cf. Valerius himself, v. 551 'fare, an patriam spes ulla videndi'; vi. 661 'respiciens, an vera soror' (and Kühner, *Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*², ii. 1. 12).

It is possible to argue that, given the necessity of a choice, a personal pronoun is preferable to an auxiliary verb here, as it emphasizes the point better: even though *Venus herself* has taken a share in the assault, Medea's heart has

not been captivated. At vii. 176 and viii. 350 the personal pronoun is elided although emphasized. It is noteworthy that, sparing though Valerius is in the elision of long syllables, a large proportion of the examples are personal pronouns—to the last two quotations add, for example, i. 118; iii. 293, 304; iv. 121; v. 490, 517, 537; vi. 536; vii. 96, 131, 238, 420, 453; viii. 109, 198, 387.

The Queen's College, Oxford

J. D. P. BOLTON

ARISTARCHUS' 'τέλος', ODYSSEY xxiii. 296

ARISTARCHUS is said to have stated that the *Odyssey* originally ended at Book xxiii, line 296. A case can be made out for an ending at about this point, but the choice of line 296 causes certain difficulties that are avoided by preferring line 299.

(This suggestion does not depend directly on the definition of τέλος, but I assume that it has not been proved that Aristarchus used it in the sense 'climax', and that any 'continuations' are at least pre-Pisistratean.)

In line 296 Odysseus and Penelope go to bed; by line 299 all the other chief actors in the day's drama are seen to the beds which their strenuous activities have richly earned them. Odysseus is treated as a guest on his first night home and Telemachus, for the last time, is the man of Penelope's house and goes to bed last. The general movement to bed removes Stanford's quaint objection that line 296, as a finish, suggests a Victorian novelette. No anticlimax is involved in packing off the minor (but still leading) characters. The picture of μέγαλα σκῶεντα (as the translators confirm by their paragraphing) forms a very effective finish, leaving the darkened stage after the actors' farewells—a perfect example of the Greek feeling for a quiet ending, with all tensions relaxed and loose ends tied.

The adoption of line 299 avoids certain linguistic difficulties also. τῷ in line 300 has to refer back over four lines, skipping four other possible antecedents. Surely, if lines 297-9 were written by the Continuer, he could have managed it more neatly.

Further, Odysseus and Penelope have been plural in lines 288, 293, and 295, and, though τῷ of a conjugal pair is unexceptionable in itself, it seems clear that the sudden change of number has been forced on the Continuer, to avoid confusion, by the already existent 297-9.

The second difficulty is caused by μὲν in line 295. Kirchhoff attempted to explain this as an accommodation of an original οἱ δ' ἄρ'. But if we end at line 299, οἱ μὲν is

answered by αὐτὰρ in line 297. One almost wonders why the Continuer did not cut out 297-9, accommodating οἱ μὲν in 295 to οἱ δ' ἄρ' (like an inverted Kirchhoffian) and starting his Continuation αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ φίλο-τητος!

We do not know why Aristarchus chose line 296; but unless he had manuscript authority for it, which is extremely unlikely in view of the complete silence on the subject, there can be no refutation on external grounds of the internal evidence given above.

F. L. KAY

King Edward's School, Birmingham

A NOTE ON THE SPARTAN EMBASSY TO ATHENS (408/7 B.C.)

ANDROTION, *F. Gr. Hist.* 324 f 44, Εὐκτῆμων Κυδαθηναῖος ἐπὶ τούτου πρέσβεις ἦλθον ἀπὸ Λακεδαιμόνιος Ἀθήναζε Μέγίλλος καὶ Ἐνδιος καὶ Φιλοχαρίδας, κτλ. Jacoby in his commentary remarks that Usener (*Kl. Schr.* i. 204 ff.) restored the names correctly. Philocharidas and Endios are well known elsewhere, especially in their other negotiations with Athens. But Megillos does not appear in any other historical context, unless in 396 B.C. (*Xen. Hell.* iii. 4. 6) as an ambassador to Tissaphernes. However, as Jacoby continues: 'Perhaps we may infer from Μέγίλλος Λακεδαιμόνιος in Plato's *Laus* that he too was known in Athens and had connexions there similar to those of Endios, though it is somewhat surprising that A. then had mentioned the youngest ambassador in the first place.' But one passage in the *Laus* (i. 642 b) makes the connexion of Megillos with Athens quite specific. For Plato puts into his mouth the statement that he is a *proxenos* of Athens. Of course, one need not suppose that the character in the dialogue is meant to be an historical portrait. At the same time in this passage Plato goes out of his way to make the Spartan and Cretan interlocutors explain in turn to the

anonymous Athenian the reasons why they personally have special links with Athens. The Cretan claims to be a relative of Epimenides and through him to have hereditary associations with the city, while Megillos, as we have seen, states that he is *proxenos*. Presumably Plato was conscious of the dramatic improbability of representing a Spartan and a Cretan as listening attentively while an Athenian expounded to them an ideal constitution. Only Dorians with a special prejudice in favour of Athens would be likely to be so amenable (cf. A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work*, p. 465).

Hence I suggest that Plato chose for his Spartan interlocutor the name of a dead *proxenos* of Athens, which he could remember from his youth. This would explain, what Jacoby wonders at, why the youngest ambassador should be named first by Androtion. Moreover, by giving all three ambassadors records of relations with Athens, this suggestion may strengthen the hypothesis (cf. Usener, op. cit., and Busolt, *Gr. Ges.* iii. 1565 and contrast Ehrenberg in P.-W., s.n. 'Megillos'), that, though Androtion is only quoted for their negotiations about the ransoming of prisoners, their real purpose was to sound Alcibiades on the prospect of an agreed peace.

H. W. PARKE

Trinity College, Dublin

ancient sources mention the myth (all in P.-W., *R.E.* iii A 655, s.v. 'Skylla'), and the form *κεῖρις* has been also preserved (cf. Hesychius, s.v. *κεῖρις*, P.-W., *R.E.* xi. 115, s.v. 'Keiris', and D'Arcy Thompson, *Glossary of Greek Birds*, s.v. *κεῖρις*). If, as appears most probable, Callimachus also used that form (fr. 113, see also fr. 288 Pfeiffer), when writing about the same myth, I should be inclined to see the Cyrenean poet as one of the main sources from which later Alexandrian and Roman poets drew (Parthenius, fr. 20 Martini, [Virgil], *Ciris*, Ovid, *Metam.* viii. 1 ff., etc.).

As regards the context of [Moschus] iii. 37, [Virgil], *Ciris*, 514 ff.

quae simul ut sese cano de gurgite velox
cum sonitu ad caelum stridentibus extulit
alis
et multum late dispersit in aequora rorem,
infelix virgo nequiquam a morte recepta
incultum solis in rupibus exigit aevum,
rupibus et scopulis et litoribus desertis.

and Rutilius Namatianus, ii. 54:

Nisaeum crinem flere putantur aves
would support my suggestion. So I would read the line:

οὐ τόνον εἰναλίσαι παρ' ἥδοι μύρατο Κείρις.

C. A. TRYPANIS

Exeter College, Oxford

[MOSCHUS] iii. 37

οὐ τόνον εἰναλίσαι παρ' ἥδοι μύρατό σε πρίν†.

THE line presents difficulties. Wilamowitz, Edmonds, Legrand, Gallavotti, and Gow have accepted in their texts Bücheler's emendation *Σειρήν*, whereas manuscripts L and V have *σε πρίν*, Tr. *γε πρίν*, P *δὲ πρίν*, and S the Planudean emendation *δελφίν*. The manuscript readings are clearly corrupt, and the emendation of Planudes unacceptable, because a weeping bird and not a fish is required to fit the context (cf. *Ἀηδών*, *Χελιδών*, *Κῆρυξ*, etc., of the following lines). Moreover, Bücheler's *Σειρήν* is of little help, because we know of no human being that was turned into a Siren (and that is what the context demands), and anyhow in the Greek literary tradition Sirens were always half women and half birds.

I believe that *Κείρις* was the name the poet wrote at the end of l. 37. It was said to be the sea-bird (cf. *εἰναλίσαι παρ' ἥδοι*) into which Scylla, the daughter of Nisus, was metamorphosed, after the unhappy love-affair with Minos which resulted in the murder of her father. A great number of

HORACE, SAT. i. 6. 104-5

nunc mihi curto
ire licet mulo vel si libet usque Tarentum.

HORACE's 'gelded mule' has received short shrift from editors, although this interpretation of *curto* appeared in Forcellini's Lexicon as long ago as 1831. Later scholars have been content to repeat Orelli's dictum that 'male mules, being by nature unable to impregnate, are not castrated'. Plessis and Lejay (1911) come nearest to accepting *curto* as a reference to castration: but they suggest that Horace is describing his mount as a quiet one by 'une plaisanterie peu conforme à notre goût'; and by *plaisanterie* they imply that Horace believed, as they appear to have done themselves, that the practice of castration for mules was redundant and the suggestion ridiculous.

Other interpretations are based either on the literal meanings of *curtus* ('defective' or 'mutilated') or on its metaphorical sense of 'poor', 'inadequate'; and none is wholly satisfactory. The objection to the metaphorical interpretations ('cheap', 'plain'—Orelli, Gow, Kiessling-Heinze) is that *curtus*

elsewhere is predicated in this sense only of the abstract or inanimate, never of living things, and always with emphasis on an unsatisfactory state of affairs.¹ Of the literal interpretations, many (e.g. 'stout and short-bellied', 'thin and stunted')—noticed by Maclean and Orelli respectively—are mere conjectures to suit the context; 'having an unsightly tail' (Krüger) is not reinforced by Prop. iv. 1. 20, where *curto equo* means 'tail-less', in reference to the mutilation at the ceremony of the *Ecus October*. Comm. Cruq.'s note '*curto, curtata cauda*' is in conformity with the normal literal meaning of 'mutilated' or 'lacking some part':² but, since there is no evidence for the docking of mules' or horses' tails in antiquity, and much for the castration of many domesticated animals, 'bob-tailed' seems an unnecessary flight of imagination.

It must be admitted that there seems to be no direct evidence for or against the gelding of mules. The absence of specific mention by Columella cannot be taken as decisive. In Book vi he treats first of oxen, under a number of heads, ending the main division with a section on the castration of bulls. There follow two long sections on horses, their various ailments and cures, in the course of which he never mentions gelding. In the next section, on mules, he explains that he will treat only of those matters in which mules differ from horses. This arrangement clearly does not preclude the gelding of mules, any more than it does of stallions: the description of the treatment of bulls is intended to be of wider application. On the other hand, the advantages of gelding, in making an animal more manageable, were well known,³ and so was the fact that, whereas a male mule cannot reproduce its kind, it can and does go through the physical acts of reproduction.⁴ Its sterility appears to be due to some defect of spermatogenesis and not to lack of the sex hormone; and it follows that if the male mule is not castrated he may become exceedingly difficult to handle.

In the army at the present day it is normal to castrate all male mules, as a routine measure, before they are issued to units. It is surely a reasonable assumption that, since the operation and its effects were well known in antiquity, gelding was often in use for so

contrary an animal as the mule; and that Horace, far from indulging in an elaborate *plaisanterie*, was referring to recognized veterinary practice.

W. D. ASHWORTH
M. ANDREWES

Bedford College, London

THE SENATOR'S RETIRING AGE: 65 or 60?

THE elder Seneca puts into the mouth of P. Asprenas the statement that senators were not compelled to attend the senate after their sixty-fifth year (*Controv.* i. 8. 4); the younger writes (*de Brev. Vitae* 20): 'lex . . . a sexagesimo (anno) senatorem non citat' (cf. Pseudo-Quintil. 306). Mommsen comments that the discrepancy is probably due to a lowering of the age of compulsory attendance under Claudius or earlier (*Staatsrecht*³, iii. 917, n. 2).

Several considerations make it seem most probable that the innovation is to be attributed to Claudius. His campaign to revive the dignity of the senate and his vain attempts to increase the '*maiestas huius ordinis*' (*B.G.U.* 611—Bruns, *Fontes*⁷, 53, col. iii) are attested by the sources (Dio lx. 11. 6–8, 12. 1–5; Suet. *Claud.* 23–24; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 6–7, 25. 5–6; xii. 52. 4). Senatorial membership in his view was not only a privilege, for those worthy of it, but an obligation—which Surdinius Gallus was not permitted to evade by transferring his home to Carthage (Dio lx. 29. 2, epit.). Permission for senators to leave Italy was to be sought from the emperor (Suet. *Claud.* 23. 2, 24. 1; Dio lx. 25. 6) and travel restrictions were imposed (Suidas, s.v. *Κλαύδιος*). He was so strict about the increased senatorial attendance which the new regulations must have produced that, it is alleged, some who had been absent committed suicide (Dio lx. 11. 8).

The measure exempting the 60–65 age-group from compulsory attendance can be attributed with greatest probability to Claudius, since it is, in the first place, completely consonant with his object of regularity and efficiency. It is also in keeping with the consideration of an emperor who would visit those senators who were ill (lx. 12. 1), give a special place in the senate to those who were hard of hearing (lx. 12. 3), and stand in sympathy when they had been on their feet for any considerable time (*ibid.*).

D. McALINDON

University of Sheffield

¹ Cf. Hor. *Od.* iii. 24. 64 and Pers. *Sat.* 4. 52.

² Cf. Hor. *Sat.* i. 9. 70; Cels. vii. 8. 4.

³ Cf. Varro, *R.R.* ii. 7. 15, etc.: see further, Apul. *Met.* vii. 23.

⁴ Cf. Aristotle, *H.N.* 577^b 21 ff.

REVIEWS

PINDAR

JACQUELINE DUCHEMIN: *Pindare, poète et prophète*. Pp. 390. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955. Paper, 1,400 fr.

THIS is an interesting and stimulating book, the work of a sympathetic and intelligent lover of Pindar. Professor Duchemin is deeply familiar with his poetry; and her occasional slips and blunders are often those of a scholar who trusts too much to a good memory, for instance when she writes (p. 165) 'le devin Coiranos' for Polyidos (called here *Koupavidas*) in *O.* 13. 75, or when she says that in *P.* 1. 24 *φοίνισσα φλόξ* is applied to Zeus's thunderbolt, or in her muddled account, on p. 65 n. 2, of Pindar's death 'durant une représentation au théâtre d'Argos'.

Sometimes, too, she relies on out-dated textual authority, for instance on p. 116 n. 4, where she discusses the evidence for *μέγας* in *O.* 2. 85 on the assumption that this is Mommsen's conjecture, whereas it was proposed by Pauw in 1747 and confirmed by a papyrus in 1927. Again, by taking over from Bergk, perhaps by way of Rumpel's *Lexicon* of 1883, an obsolete text of the Aratus scholia, put right by E. Maass in 1898, she says that Pindar (*fr.* 282) represented the source of the Nile 'sous la forme d'une gigantesque statue de Ganymède déversant de son urne des flots de nectar' (p. 305). In fact the scholiast on Aratus 282 is offering two alternative explanations of the meaning of the constellation Aquarius, one that the figure represents Ganymede pouring out a liquid *ἦτις εἰκάζεται τῷ νέκταρι*, the other that he represents *τὸν παρὰ τῷ Πινδάρῳ ἑκατοντορόγιον ἀνδριάντα ἀφ' οὗ τῆς κινήσεως τῶν ποδῶν τὸν Νεῖλον πλημμυρεῖν*. Other ancient writers call Pindar's figure a *δαίμων*, and Snell follows Wilamowitz in changing *ἀνδριάντα* to *δαίμονα*: in any case he has nothing to do with Ganymede.

Professor Duchemin is, however, well aware (p. 15) of the vital importance of 'l'examen le plus précis du texte, dans ses détails les plus obscurs', and in general her treatment of the text is adequate as a basis for the descriptions and arguments which make up her book, though she is too apt to argue from Puech's renderings, which are often loose or disputable, for instance in his absurd translation of *N.* 4. 82-83: 'l'or que l'on passe au feu n'est plus que splendeur fulgurante'. It is true that she often disagrees with him, but not always happily, as in her treatment (p. 157) of *θυγεῖν* in *P.* 9. 42.

The book falls into four main parts: (i) 'L'inspiration et ses sources divines' (pp. 19-94); (ii) 'Le message pindarique et la tradition' (pp. 95-190); (iii) 'L'expression et le symbolisme' (pp. 191-265); (iv) 'La mission sacrée du poète' (pp. 269-334): these parts are preceded by a short Introduction and followed by a short Conclusion.

The first part is chiefly concerned with an interesting and valuable examination of Pindar's treatment of the Muses and of the Charites, and more briefly of the Nereids and the Seasons: her chief conclusion is expressed thus (p. 93): 'Là où les Muses apportaient seulement la science des exploits illustres, nous faisant connaître ceux du passé, puis transmettant à la postérité ceux

d'aujourd'hui, les Charites font davantage, puisqu'elles œuvrent cette matière en la parant des couleurs les plus fraîches et des chants les plus doux.'

The second part emphasizes (and exaggerates) the overwhelming predominance, in Pindar's mind, of Zeus and Apollo over all the other gods, and discusses the character of his allegories and personifications and his choice and treatment of heroes and myths. Here and in the rest of the book much emphasis is laid on the mystical elements in Pindar's thought, and on his connexion with the doctrines of Pythagoras. In this part, and in the third which deals especially with images and symbols connected with light and bright colours, with gold, and with natural growth, there is much that is useful, but in places she is too much influenced by Norwood, for whose *Pindar* she more than once expresses a surprising admiration, though she does not always follow him. The fourth part concentrates on what has gradually revealed itself as her chief interest, her belief that immortality lies at the heart of Pindar's thought.

It is difficult to describe briefly these closely packed chapters or to form a confident estimate of their value, and only a few points can be selected for discussion here. Professor Duchemin is deeply read in the modern literature of ancient religion, not least that written in English, and she also shows a sound acquaintance with the archaeological evidence, for instance (p. 251 n. 2) with recent discoveries at Paestum. She quotes much from Babylonian and Egyptian texts, especially to illustrate the symbolism of gold: this is often striking, but it is hard to accept her suggestion (p. 219) that Pindar 'avait connaissance de sources littéraires et religieuses appartenant aux civilisations de l'Asie antérieure'. It is strange that she shows, I think, no acquaintance with Bury's *Nemeans* or *Isthmians*, for her work has much affinity with his, both in its merits and in its defects.

Throughout the book she stresses every turn of expression which, in her view, conveys the suggestion of immortality, including all narratives of long and dangerous voyages, which she takes to symbolize visits to the other world, and she finds many veiled references to initiation ceremonies, again regarded as symbols of escape from death. Her inferences are often unconvincing. For instance on p. 39 she has the following strange comment on the close of the Fourth *Pythian*: 'Les termes ἀμβροσίωv ἐτέων sont très forts; mais ne croyons pas que l'auteur les emploie au hasard ni avec un sens usé; à notre avis, ἀμβροσίωv doit être pris en son sens le plus plein; il s'agit, selon toute vraisemblance, d'une source où l'on puise des paroles d'immortalité, d'une de ces initiations qui préparent le séjour des Bienheureux tel qu'il est évoqué dans la II^e *Olympique*.'

The last words are revealing, for Professor Duchemin would extend the significance of the Second *Olympian* and the famous *Threnoi* fragments to cover the whole of Pindar's thought. Again and again (see pp. 45, 173, 309) she runs together the pictures of the destinies of Peleus and Cadmus and their children presented respectively in *O.* 2 and in *P.* 3.

This is not justifiable. The gulf between the views expressed in the small group connected with the Second *Olympian* and those common to the great bulk of Pindar's work is unbridgeable. It is true that Pindar often suggests to his clients that he can give them a shadow of immortality by saving their memories from oblivion, and in some passages of her book it is hardly clear that Professor Duchemin claims more than this, but towards the end, especially on pp. 333 f., she makes it plain that she holds that in the *Epinicia* he regularly

conveys to the victors the strong hope at least of a definite personal immortality in a happy other life, reserved for a limited number of mortals of outstanding merit. Yet from the early Tenth *Pythian* to the late Eighth *Pythian* Pindar is repeatedly at pains to emphasize the brevity and transitoriness of those golden moments of godlike felicity, *ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ*, which are all that mortals may enjoy.

The book has three good indexes, *Locorum*, *Nominum*, and *Rerum*.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. S. ROBERTSON

GREEK THEATRE

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *Greek Theatre Production*. Pp. xv+206, 24 plates. London: Methuen, 25s. net.

PROFESSOR WEBSTER offers 'a chronological and topographical history of costumes, masks, and scenery from the earliest times down to the late Hellenistic period'. Part i (pp. 1-96) is concerned with Athens; Part ii (pp. 97-163) has a chapter of 30 pages on Sicily and Italy and shorter ones on Mainland Greece, the Islands, and Asia and Africa; a short summing-up is added. There follows a useful list of the more important monuments thought to be connected with the theatre, with references to the places where each is reproduced and to the pages of this book where each is discussed. This is extracted from a list of more than 1,500 monuments, originally based on the list in M. Bieber's *Denkmäler zum Theaterwesen im Altertum* of 1920, but now considerably longer than this. This list can be seen in the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London, and work on it is to continue. The book has an index.

The introduction contains a salutary warning against the dangers presented by the evidence we have to rely on in this branch of study. The plays themselves can be used only with great caution; the secondary literature is mostly late and often unreliable; and the archaeologists who investigate ancient theatres seldom agree in their results. Nor is it easy to know how far we can trust vase-paintings, masks, statues, and other works of art. The artist, Webster points out, is not a photographer; and even when he is consciously illustrating a stage production, he may insist on telling you more about the play than any one scene of its production could tell you. All this is true; and indeed I wonder if Webster goes quite far enough. He seems to draw the general conclusion that monuments, for all their own limitations as evidence, are a safer guide than the plays themselves. The dramatist, he says on p. xi, could only be sure of one production, and so wrote mainly for a reading public. This not only begs important questions about 'country' performances and about the extent of the fifth-century reading public; it ignores the known fact that these plays were written to be acted. Further, Webster's account of the dangers that attend the use of monuments is not complete. Take, for example, his remarks about stage scenes on vase paintings. These must be interpreted, he says, according to the general rules for understanding the scenes on Greek vases. But vases that may relate to stage productions form, *ex hypothesi*, a special category; and even if the 'general rules' Webster speaks of were a good deal more hard and fast than they in fact are, it would not always be safe to use them to interpret vases of this sort. How far, for instance, can we use the vases to determine the nature

of stage backgrounds at different periods? A careful scrutiny of a large body of evidence bearing on a particular problem might yield a reasonably safe conclusion; but where there is less material it is dangerous to forget that the artist who represents a stage scene is not compelled to reproduce it with close exactitude. It is no disparagement of the book before me to say that it leaves one even more conscious than before of the incompleteness and elusiveness of the evidence we have.

Webster begins by describing the Attic theatre and its scenery and stage-machinery. He is a good deal more sanguine than Pickard-Cambridge regarding the eccyclema, the prothyron, and the conclusions that can be drawn from certain plays. None of his reasons for thinking that the eccyclema can be *proved* to have been used during the fifth century is convincing. The limited space at his disposal may be his excuse; but he never comes to grips with Pickard-Cambridge's arguments regarding its possible use in the *P.V.*, the *Ajax*, and the *Peace*, and his discussion of the *Dictyulci* is completely unconvincing. He rightly warns the reader that the inferences he draws from the Dioscurides mosaics are not certain; but he should not treat Marx's conjecture that one of them illustrates the *Synaristosae* as if it were a certainty. His handling of the Boscoreale murals is adventurous; contrast that of Pickard-Cambridge (*Theatre of Dionysus*, pp. 227 f.). His use of the oenochoe with the comic Perseus as evidence for the fifth-century stage seems to me rash; see Pickard-Cambridge, *Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, p. 237. But Webster may be right in contending against Pickard-Cambridge (*Theatre*, pp. 165 f.) that the scene partly preserved in the Italian papyrus of the *Theoporumene* could have been acted on a narrow stage.

The section on costume is prefaced by a brief discussion of the origins; then tragedy, old and middle comedy, and new comedy are treated separately. Webster argues that the padded dancers on sixth-century vases represent satyrs. But these dancers first occur on Corinthian ware; where they are found in Attic, Laconian, and Chiote, it is in a style that imitates Corinthian; and some dancers in Attic and all in Fikellura seem to be without padding. How can we be sure that they were known outside Corinth? and how can we know that even there they meant anything to anyone but the painters and their customers? Similar considerations apply to his treatment of the vases shown in Plate 2 (pp. 17, 19, 29 f.). Webster tentatively suggests that the *χειδωτός χιτών* and high boots derive from some performance in honour of Dionysus. But the early occurrences (summarized on p. 37) yield no certain evidence for this; and it may be that the costume was simply chosen as possessing *σεμνότης*. Webster rightly holds that we cannot be *certain* that Euripidean characters like Telephus and Electra really wore the rags in which they are imagined; but both Euripides and Aristophanes insist so firmly on the point that one can hardly feel sure that they did not. Webster maintains the view that comic actors wore the 'obscene padded costume', which includes for him the phallus; W. Beare's article at *C.Q.*, n.s. iv (1954), 64 f. deserves at least a reference. Webster's treatment of masks is similar to that in his article of 1949, though he does not reprint the table at the end. He seems to me to devote a space out of proportion to the size of the book to the attempt to assign the right mask from Pollux's list to each character in the surviving plays. When played by a scholar with Webster's close acquaintance with the texts and monuments, this game is an entertaining one; but it does not yield safe results (see Pickard-Cambridge,

Festivals, pp. 210 f.). In particular, the suggestion that individual families in new comedy had their own styles of hair-dressing rests on insufficient evidence; so, I think, does the dating of the *δῆλος* as early as Lycurgus.

Webster is more cautious than formerly about arguing from South Italian vases to Athenian stage conditions; but he maintains his view that from the end of the fifth century Attic comedy was as popular in South Italy as Attic tragedy. This may be right, and can scarcely be proved wrong; but it remains true that there is no scene on a fourth-century Italian vase which *must* come from an Attic rather than a local comedy. Webster's surmises regarding the special character of South Italian stage setting are interesting, but hardly safe. How far can we be sure that the palaces or *aediculae* (Webster does not like this term) shown on South Italian vases indicate the nature of contemporary stage settings? and are we justified in using one such vase to interpret another in the way, for instance, that Webster does on p. 104? Different people will give different answers.

For the rest of the Greek world, we have not enough material to form anything like a general picture. In the chapter on Mainland Greece the evidence of vases is supplemented by the indications derived from Athenaeus' statements about pre-dramatic performances and the excavations of the shrines of Ortheia and the Cabiri and the theatres at Delphi and Olynthus. Webster's suggestion (p. 131, cf. p. 156) that Homer (*Il.* ix. 502 f.) modelled his conception of Ate and Litaë on 'a chorus of men dressed as wrinkled old women dancing in honour of a gorgon-headed Artemis' is a very long shot indeed. Most of the chapter on the Islands is devoted to a summary of the results of the excavation of the Delian theatre; and in the chapter on Asia and Africa Webster discusses a few terra-cottas and some of the Hellenistic inscriptions relating to the guilds of actors.

The final summary is useful; and (with the unfortunate exception of that illustrating the Pronomus Vase, much better shown in Pickard-Cambridge, *Festivals*, fig. 28) the plates are excellent. One of them contains a new relief from the Agora illustrating a comic chorus, on which Webster has more to say in *Wiener Studien*, lxix (1956), 111 f. They have been carefully chosen to illustrate the text; and considering the size and price of the book, they do its publishers great credit. It is not their fault, nor that of the author, that even the general reader will constantly feel the need to refer to other books that give more illustrations, and particularly to Pickard-Cambridge's two standard works. In this branch of study it is all-important for the reader to be able to examine the material; and without numerous illustrations the clearest and most cautious assessment of the evidence must be incomplete. That is one reason why even the general reader, provided he is capable of judging where to skip, will find Pickard-Cambridge's two books (if he can buy or borrow them) more useful to him than this one. Another reason is that Pickard-Cambridge is not only clearer in his exposition and more cautious in his judgements but much more willing to warn the reader of the existence of opinions other than his own. None the less this learned and ingenious work is useful; and to professional scholars its plates and list of monuments make it particularly valuable.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

PROTAGORAS

ANTONIO CAPIZZI: *Protagora, le testimonianze e i frammenti*. Edizione riveduta e ampliata con uno studio su la vita, le opere, il pensiero e la fortuna. Pp. 443. Florence: Sansoni, 1955. Paper.

THIS work brings home to one how many books and articles have been written about Protagoras—especially in Italy. The fact seems to be that most of them, judging by Capizzi's reports, could safely be committed to oblivion. Capizzi himself has now written on Protagoras at greater length, perhaps, than any of his predecessors. His book would without question have been more valuable if it had been kept to about one-third of its present length; this would have produced a simpler arrangement, less inaccuracy, less repetition, and fewer references to the cruder fantasies of the last hundred years. It is a false ideal of scholarship that tends to keep any theory, however improbable, alive in classical footnotes as a blight on printer and on reader alike.

Capizzi's treatment, in spite of its diffuseness, possesses some share of the saving quality of common sense, and many of the wilder interpretations are at length laid flat—only to rise again, one fears, when the next even longer monograph appears. His work is in essence an edition of the testimonies and fragments, with copious commentaries disposed both before and after the texts. This arrangement is at times confusing. Thus there are three long preliminary chapters on the testimonies, the fragments, and the translation of the fragments, which deal with many questions of meaning and interpretation before the scope of the evidence has been properly revealed. Then come the texts, and the last 200 pages are devoted to a very discursive treatment (in which parts of the first three chapters are repeated) of Protagoras' life, works, and doctrines, of the assessment of him by his successors, and finally of his historical position. There follow a large bibliography and indexes.

Questions of method are discussed at some length in the introduction; but in the selection of texts the practical results are disappointing. Capizzi adds forty 'absolutely new' passages to the testimonies and imitations collected by Diels, and two 'absolutely new' fragments or verbatim quotations. It soon appears that most of these additions are absolutely otiose, being simply late repetitions based upon passages already in Diels-Kranz, and adding nothing to them. The lesser commentators on Aristotle, and Aristocles in Eusebius, are made to provide many passages which add precisely nothing. For example, Capizzi prints Aristotle's reference at *Rhet.* B 24, 1402^a23 to Protagoras' profession of making the lesser opinion the stronger, and then appends the following remark by the anonymous commentator on the *Rhetorica*: 'Protagoras used to profess to make the lesser opinion the greater'. This is just like collating a sixteenth-century manuscript known to have been copied, with additional mistakes, from some earlier extant manuscript, and then citing its readings in the apparatus criticus. In only a very few cases are Capizzi's additions to Diels useful, and even then they are of minor importance: e.g. Plato, *Theaet.* 164 c, and Alexander's comment on Aristotle *Met.* B 2, 998^a2 (mistranslated). In the collection of fragments Capizzi is equally erratic, though his criticisms of Diels in this respect are not unjustified. Capizzi places far too much weight on the form of a citation, that is, whether it is given in direct or in reported speech. It can easily be demonstrated that phrases like λέγων οὕτως, followed by a

statement in direct speech, were often used carelessly, or in a non-literal sense, to introduce a palpable paraphrase. Conversely sentences which from their language can be recognized as verbatim quotations were not infrequently given in indirect speech. Thus sentences extracted from the Aristotelian commentators Elias and Asclepias (Capizzi, fr. 1 and 2), though formally direct quotations, are almost certainly mere summaries of judgements in Aristotle, given in a direct form by their authors perhaps with the object of impressing, or of lending variety. In the case of Capizzi's fr. 3 there are not even formal reasons to recommend it as a verbatim quotation. Consisting of the words *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντιλέγειν*, it is extracted from Diog. L. ix. 53, where it is simply given as the content of a *λόγος*: Diogenes derived this information, as he himself said, from Plato's *Euthydemus*. To count this as a new fragment, then, is without justification. It is more serious, perhaps, that Capizzi's fr. 8, a list of Protagoras' works from Diog. L. ix. 55, is made to begin as follows: '*Περὶ πάλης, περὶ τῶν μαθημάτων . . .*': here Capizzi has simply suppressed the first item on Diogenes' list, namely *Τέχνη ἐριστικῶν*, not even indicating the omission with dots, since he considers this not to have been a real book title. To these and similar faults in the selection of texts must be added frequent mistakes in the printing of the Greek (especially the use of *ε* for *η* and of *ξ* for *ζ*), as well as an unattractive and confusing layout.

The most interesting and useful part of the book is part i, chapter 3, on 'The Translation of the Fragments', in which Capizzi considers at length, but sometimes not unprofitably, the connotation of terms like *χρῆμα* and *πᾶγμα*, *μέτρον*, and *ἀληθές*. The attempt to distinguish *δοκεῖν* and *φαίνεσθαι*, and *λόγος* and *ἔπος*, is pressed rather far. In the course of the chapter Capizzi argues that the emphasis in the *πάντων μέτρον ἄνθρωπος* fragment is on the second part, 'of the existence of the things that are and the non-existence of the things that are not', as a reference to the Eleatic intransigence on the meaning of *εἶναι*. This is a useful counter to the usual tendency to under value this second part of the fragment; at the same time Capizzi does not completely account for the emphatic position and phrasing of 'man is the measure' (where he takes *ἄνθρωπος* as meaning no more than *τις*).

For those who are prepared to spend much time and patience there is some reward in this book, not least in the cautious treatment of Plato as a source of evidence for Protagoras, and in the conservative assessment of the extent of Protagoras' positive doctrines.

Trinity Hall, Cambridge

G. S. KIRK

EPIGRAMMATA COACERVATA

WERNER PEEK: *Griechische Vers-Inschriften*. Band i: *Grab-Epigramme*. Pp. xxx+695. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1955. Paper, DM. 70.

THE days when a single scholar could cheerfully embark on the editing of an epigraphic *Corpus* had, one might have thought, vanished with the generation of Boeckh; although many epigraphists claim particular interests in one field or another, and may indeed assemble all the epigraphy of a single site or of a single and comparatively narrow category, the attempt to make a *Corpus* of Greek inscriptions in verse, to replace the time-honoured volume of Kaibel,

might have daunted even Werner Peek's youthful enthusiasm when, in the early 1930's, he embarked on this titanic project. A reviewer must begin by expressing at once his admiration for the undertaking in itself, and for the courage which, despite every circumstance of adversity, has brought it thus far on the road to completion. It is a work for which, of course, Professor Peek has relied a great deal on the willing assistance of his friends and correspondents; but the bulk of the labour remains his own, and will long endure as his major epigraphic monument. Indispensable to the libraries alike of learned institutions and individual *savants*, it will be a standard reference for generations to come who will look to their 'Peek' as they have hitherto looked to their 'Kaibel'. In view of the magnitude of the work, and the many thousands of points of detail which its author has had to consider, criticism cannot avoid seeming petty or captious; for, whatever the precautions, errors of mechanics or judgement in this or that instance creep in. The most up-to-date edition may be invalidated by tomorrow's discoveries, so that in some matters *Griechische Vers-Inschriften* i, despite its *addenda*, is even now in need of marginal notation (but alas, the absorbent paper on which it is printed makes it difficult to add the marginalia where they are needed).

The work is planned to be complete in four volumes. The first contains all the *carmina sepulcralia* on which Peek could lay his hands; vol. ii will contain the remaining *carmina*, with a commentary in vol. iii, while indexes and the (by then much augmented) *addenda et corrigenda* must await vol. iv. It is to be hoped that they will not wait too long. For in the volume under review there are no indexes whatsoever (apart from an initial *Inhaltsübersicht*), and without them it is extremely difficult to use. Even an interim index of first lines would have been helpful, if a *comparatio numerorum* or an index of names or places of origin were beyond present powers. As it is, all one can do, in searching for Peek's text of a wanted inscription, is to try to think under what category he might have put it, and look in that section. This may sound easy, but success does not come readily; the best plan is to make a note of any required references and then, when sufficient have been amassed to make the labour worth while, to go through the volume page by page. And even then one can miss what one is looking for. This lack of an index is a basic lack which impedes beyond measure the present use of vol. i; so it may of vol. ii, unless (and it is perhaps no bad thing to record the hope) the want is in some degree supplied in that volume at least.

Unless one is engaged on the search just mentioned, this is no book to read from cover to cover. Greek epitaphs seldom rise to poetic heights; those of the archaic period frequently move by their simplicity, but those of later epochs tend to ring rather sterile changes on a few general types and phrases. No doubt the emotion of the bereaved who had them set up was real enough, but little of it shines through what often was trite and often also tedious. The modern world has on the whole done better. Sometimes a particularly naïve account of the circumstances of death (e.g. 1159) makes charming reading.¹ Occasionally there is some attempt at a play on words (1023, 1711), though

¹ Cf. (from Plumstead) on James Darling, aged 10 years:

Weep not for me, my parents dear:
There is no witness wanted here.
The hammer of death was given to me

For eating cherries off the tree.
Next morning death to me was sweet,
My blessed Jesus for to meet;
He did ease me of my pain,
And I did join his holy train.

none with the dexterity shown in a London epitaph.² The ingenuity of the dialogue poems (1831 ff., especially 1844, 1882) frequently impresses, but these have none of the quality of, for example, Vondel's epitaph for Admiral van Galen.³ The realism of 1166 has no modern parallel in verse that comes to mind, although the practical outlook of a prose example from Stoke Newington may be quoted.⁴

Peek's method, which he selected after much thought, that of division by type and motif, enables comparisons to be drawn between styles and periods in a way impossible under Kaibel's geographical arrangement. At times the overlap between one type and another within the poem makes classification awkward, but no system would be foolproof, and it is hard to see what better could have been done here. Peek's arrangement, like his method of work, is fully explained in his comprehensive and important preface.

Interspersed among the texts are some, like 864 and 1005-6, now edited for the first time, which deserve a separate and fuller publication elsewhere. In other cases Peek has revised the text with the aid of squeezes, photographs, and his own observation, or with as many of these aids as were possible. He has spent long years on the study of epigrammatic forms and style, and his unrivalled command of this field has enabled him to level justified criticism at the work of others in it (e.g. Wilhelm and L. Robert). But in such circumstances and with such experience the temptation to restore missing verses on the basis of *Stilgefühl* must be considerable. In the past, it might well be said, some of Peek's restorations could be regarded as *abenteuerlich* (cf. his review of Raubitschek's *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*) or as infelicitous (for a recent instance cf. *S.E.G.* xiii. 346b). In any case, the margin of error is wide, and in a *Corpus* of this kind it is more desirable to leave blanks than to supplement, whatever the caveats entered in the preface.

On the whole the texts given here are commendably conservative: 1096 and 1145 may serve as instances. But at times one wonders whether the restoration is really worth inclusion, at any rate in the main text (e.g. 901, 1075, 1136, 1361, 1557, 1956). Improvements made from squeeze alone or photograph alone may be risky when the original editor has himself worked from the stone (e.g. 1185 from a photograph, 1352 from a squeeze), but this is not always so (cf. 1885). Finally the inclusion of one or two epitaphs in the collection at all may be open to doubt (e.g. 512a, 512a). At any rate, the reader ought to be on his guard, and be prepared at all times to test the epigrams for himself. He

² From St. Augustine's, Watling Street, on William Lamb:

O Lamb of God, which sin didn't take away,
And as a Lamb was offered up for sin,
Where I, poor Lamb, went from thy flock astray,
Yet thou, O Lord, vouchsafe thy Lamb to win
Home to thy flock, and hold thy Lamb therein.

That, at the day when Lambs and Goats shall sever,
Of thy choice Lambs, Lamb may be one for ever.

³ Conversation between a stranger and an Amsterdammer:

S. Wien deekt dit graf? A. Den Edelen van Galen.

S. Wie zagh hem lest? A. Het Florentijnse strant.

S. Waer blonck zyn deught? A. Op zee, in bloet en stralen.

S. Wat trofze daer? A. Het hart van Engellant. etc.

⁴ On Elizabeth Picket, spinster, aged 23, daughter of a London goldsmith, who died 11 Dec. 1781, 'in consequence of her clothes taking fire the preceding evening'. It continues: 'Reader, if ever you should witness such an affecting scene, recollect that the only method to extinguish the flame is to stifle it with an immediate covering.'

may not always agree with the text as presented, but he will continually be compelled to respect, and, in the *ensemble*, to admire.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

GEOFFREY WOODHEAD

GREEK BIOGRAPHY

ALBRECHT DIHLE: *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*. Pp. 121. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1956. Paper, DM. 10.80.

IT is impossible to write a comprehensive history of Greek biography, as Dihle points out (p. 88), because only a small fraction of it survives and the losses include virtually all the substantial output of the Hellenistic age. Modern studies of the subject have tended to produce elaborate and rigid theories founded upon arbitrary reconstructions of lost works. Unlike some of his predecessors Dihle has resisted the temptation to guess the form and content of lost biographies. Most of his learned and sensitive book deals rather with non-biographical works which may be thought to have contributed to the origin of biography or to have influenced its development, and with Plutarch's *Lives*, which, because they follow the Peripatetic tradition, also throw light on this development. In an introductory chapter Dihle states which aspects of his subject he intends to study and draws a distinction between biography and related literary forms such as the encomium.

In the second and third chapters he discusses origins. He claims that Plato in his portrait of Socrates, especially in the *Apology*, sowed the seed from which genuine biography sprang. The *Apology*, though not biographical in form or in aim, presents a comprehensive picture of Socrates covering every aspect of his personality: it differs from attempts to elucidate a man's achievements by examining his personality as seen in his everyday life, for in the case of Socrates achievements and everyday life were inseparable. Various passages and works are then examined which might be deemed to rival the *Apology* as forerunners of biography: the 'obituary' passage in Euripides, *Suppliants* 860-917 (surely not a very strong claimant), the sketches of Themistocles and others by Thucydides, two passages of the *Anabasis*, encomia such as the *Evagoras* of Isocrates and the *Agésilas* of Xenophon, and finally the Socratic works of Xenophon. Dihle argues that none of these, not even the last, made a contribution to the birth of biography comparable with that of Plato's portrait of Socrates. He then discusses the importance of the individual in the years before and after 400, an importance heightened by the breakdown of the political system and the absence of any substitute before the Hellenistic period. These years were favourable to the development of literary portraiture against a background of everyday life in Athenian society, in which *ἀρετὴ* now reached a high level. Thus it was not a coincidence that Plato and Xenophon produced character studies not long after 400. At this point Dihle considers another series of authors whose claims to have influenced the rise of biography might be maintained against those of Plato, namely Ion, Stesimbrotus, and the early Attic orators, especially Lysias. All are disqualified, and Plato is left supreme.

Dihle here makes a valuable contribution to the debate on the origin of biography, and his view has much to recommend it, especially as Greek biography was so predominantly ethical. He tends, however, to overstate his case.

In Periclean Athens, Ion (whose influence, though difficult to assess, is perhaps underrated), Herodotus (whose characters should not be dismissed as mere types), and Sophocles developed an interest in character to which Plato probably owed more than Dihle admits. In these chapters some discussions of quite simple points, such as those on the Socratic works of Xenophon (pp. 29-34) and on the Attic orators (pp. 51-55), are somewhat needlessly diffuse.

In the next chapter Dihle demonstrates the indebtedness of Greek biography to Aristotelian doctrines, from which it derived its ideas about human behaviour and the terminology whereby these ideas were expressed. He deals in turn with the doctrine of *ἦθος* as revealed by *πράξεις*, with the doctrine of *πάθος*, and with the doctrine of ethical types together with the closely related doctrine of 'kinds of life'. These doctrines are shown to underlie the biographical theory of Plutarch, who derived them not directly from Aristotle but from the tradition of Peripatetic biography. Traces of them in fragments of Peripatetic writers illustrate how deeply they became embedded in this tradition. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the differences in psychological approach to biography between antiquity and modern times. Dihle qualifies the conventional view that development of character was an idea alien to the Greeks: *φύσις* could not change, but *ἦθος* might, as is seen in the *Demetrius* of Plutarch and to a lesser degree in his *Antony*. He might have stated more emphatically that the *Demetrius* is very exceptional.

The next chapter consists of an interesting and able analysis of Plutarch's *Cleomenes*. Dihle shows how skilfully Plutarch, using the ethical system of the Peripatetics, interweaves anecdote, historical narrative, and direct characterization so as to produce a complete and balanced character-study. The *Cleomenes* is chosen because its sources present no serious problem: Plutarch evidently drew almost all his material from Phylarchus—and the form of this material must have been such that it could be adapted quite easily for use in biography of the kind that Plutarch wrote. It is to be hoped that Dihle will apply the same analytical methods to other *Lives* where the sources are more complex and varied.

The last chapter examines the work of Satyrus, known chiefly from the papyrus containing part of his *Life of Euripides*, and that of Antigonos of Carystus, which was used by Diogenes Laertius. Antigonos, who dealt exclusively with contemporary philosophers of whom he had personal knowledge, seems to have written memoirs, perhaps resembling those of Ion, though constructed on an ethical basis. It is questionable whether his work, measured by the yardstick used by Dihle in earlier chapters, should be regarded as biography at all. This last chapter is somewhat less interesting and original than the rest. It shows that Dihle has chosen wisely in devoting his attention largely to extant works, although this choice involves the exclusion of important figures such as Phaenias, Idomeneus, and Neanthes.

The indexes of passages and Greek words are useful, though not exhaustive, but the index of persons and subjects is very sketchy.

University of Manchester

H. D. WESTLAKE

TERENCE AND MENANDER

JULIANE STRAUS: *Terenz und Menander: Beitrag zu einer Stilvergleichung*. Pp. ii+79. Zürich: Juris Verlag, 1955. Paper.

THIS book is an important contribution to the study of the relationship between Terence and Menander. Dr. Straus limits her investigation to stylistic features, and has produced a useful and interesting work. The first two chapters deal with Anaphora and Antithesis respectively, the third with certain features of the dialogue, and the last with characterization by stylistic means.

Throughout the work the collection of passages on which a judgement must be based as to the divergences of Terence from Menander (in the relatively narrow area investigated) is careful, and, though there will be little reason to alter Leo's estimate of Terence (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, pp. 248 ff.—still by far the best), here is detailed documentation. Dr. Straus, however, errs widely when she goes beyond the discovery and analysis of passages to a general criticism of the relative worth of the two poets as illustrated by each passage. Terence is found to be more artificial, more stereotyped, more rhetorical, etc., than Menander. Now many may agree, but here at least the judgement is based on inadequate evidence. It was irrelevant to ask what *we* think of these poets; what we need to know is: By what criteria did the Greeks reach what estimate of Menander and the Romans of Terence, and how may these criteria be related? In her discussion of the higher frequency of anaphora and antithesis in Terence, Dr. Straus writes as if Greek and Latin were one language; but it is important (to mention a single detail) that Cato (*de agr.*), Plautus, Terence, and the colloquial sections of Petronius agree in showing a high frequency of dicola and tricola, often with anaphora (cf. Lindholm, *Stilistische Studien* [Lund, 1931], pp. 197 ff., and, in general, Hofmann, *Lat. Umgangssprache*, pp. 61 ff.). A figure which may seem rhetorical in Menander needs careful analysis in Latin, and this, when it is done with the material here, will lead to a different judgement on Terence. Neither does Dr. Straus consider how much the rich literary inheritance of Menander contributed to the subtleties of dialogue and characterization, nor the long tradition of acting which may have allowed him to demand much more subtle interpretation from his actors. Dr. Straus, in fact, is prepared to devote her ingenuity to the elucidation of the fineness of Menander, but her assessments of corresponding passages of Terence seem to be answers to the leading question: How is this inferior to Menander? She need not have attempted this estimate, but, since she has, it must be said that her judgement here is superficial and characterized by the tendency to find fault with Terence as a mere 'translator'. What we want to know is: Why did Romans like Cicero and Varro rate Terence so highly? and, perhaps more important, How did Terence (and Roman comedy in general) form his style, which is recognizably the same whether he is translating Apollodorus or Menander? For these questions Dr. Straus provides some of the material on which answers must be based, but her own generalizations must often be ignored.

In the discussions of single passages, Dr. Straus shows considerable acumen and has much of interest to say; many of them merit notice, but the present reviewer must confine himself to a few typical points of disagreement:

1. In discussing anaphora, Dr. Straus tries to show that *Eun.* 885-8, *Ad.* 757-62, and *And.* 236 (pp. 3 ff.) are 'ganz und gar' Terentian; the anaphora in

these passages would then be due to Terence (since the lines would not have been in Menander). Her evidence (the occurrence of Roman ideas and words) is not adequate to show more than what Terence means by *vortere*. The question which needs to be asked of *Eun.* 885-8 is not: Are not these Roman terms and ideas? but: Might we expect to find in Menander an appeal in the form of a parody of prayer-style? The answer may well be negative (cf. Kleinknecht, *Gebetsparodie*, pp. 126 ff.), but Dr. Straus does not consider this. On *Ad.* 757 ff. we cannot say 'die Verbindung von *vita* und *mores* ist eine typisch römische' and that it therefore 'verrät ihren Ursprung', for, though it is typically Roman, similar phrases are found in Greek (cf. Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.* 1179^a19, 21 and Bonitz, *Index Arist.* 137, also Plato, *Laws* vi. 777 e, etc.), and we need other evidence to prove that the anaphora is not Menandrian. On *And.* 236 Dr. Straus says: 'ist officium die römische *σέπαις*', but this gives a Ciceronian significance to *officium*. Dr. Straus is probably right in attributing these instances of anaphora to Terence, but she is wrong in supposing it to be thus proved.

2. Dr. Straus begins her discussion of dialogue (Ch. 3) unfortunately with a misinterpretation of *Ad.* 80 and a contradiction of Donatus. She states that this greeting is only a greeting if preceded by *salve*: but, cf., e.g., *Most.* 305 (the basis of this scene is formal politeness). Donatus is right, however 'automatisch' καὶ οὐ γὰρ may be in Menander.

3. Mechanical interpretation sometimes leads Dr. Straus astray: e.g. on p. 38, where she again contradicts Donatus by a mechanical appeal to a similar phrase in a quite different context. This is a very great danger in interpreting drama, where the stage action must be imagined all the time. Dr. Straus's remarks (p. 39) on the use of *hem* are similarly superficial.

4. Several times Dr. Straus supposes imitation of Plautus by Terence, but without reckoning enough with the vast amount of lost comedy (cf. e.g. p. 3). On pp. 49 ff., she tries to draw too close the similarity of *Pseud.* I. 3 and *Phorm.* III. 2 (the close equation of *Phorm.* 492 ff. with *Pseud.* 357 ff. is unconvincing, as is p. 51 n. 1).

5. Dr. Straus overreaches herself when, to criticize Terence for failing to differentiate his characters stylistically, she quotes as a decisive point the difficulty over the division between characters at *Eun.* 46 ff. (pp. 58 f.); here, although Marouzeau follows Donatus, decisive arguments are adduced by Bentley (they can be added to) to show Donatus' division inadmissible, and Dr. Straus ought not to claim that the problem is insoluble.

A minor criticism remains: on p. 65 Dr. Straus says: 'um zu erklären, muß man schon fast zu Tiefenpsychologie greifen', where it is a question of elucidating a use of γάρ discussed by Denniston, *Greek Particles*, pp. 60 ff.; and several times (e.g. pp. 52 n. 2, 57 n. 1, 65 n. 1) there are quoted, with approval, phrases of L. A. Post, in which Menander's psychological fineness is described in terms of vague generality. A tendency to over-refinement of psychological interpretation is noticeable in several discussions of single passages.

The main criticisms made above refer to an aspect of the book which is dispensable, and, if one ignores this (as one can), Dr. Straus has produced a work which provides, in a very acute analysis, part of the evidence on which answers to essential questions about Terence must be based.

PROPERTIAN STUDIES

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY: *Propertiana*. (Cambridge Classical Studies.) Pp. xii+326. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 35s. net.

MR. SHACKLETON BAILEY has established his reputation as a Propertian scholar by articles in the classical periodicals and a trenchant paper on 'Some Recent Experiments in Propertian Criticism', published in the *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* (1952-3). He now offers the reader 'a serial study of difficult passages' in Propertius, which is based on exceptionally wide and attentive reading of other authors, Greek as well as Latin, and which, while elucidating Propertius, also contributes to a better understanding of Latin usage generally. Numerous instances could be cited to support this last statement, but it can be illustrated by reference to his notes on the following passages: i. 1. 23 (*posse* as direct object of *credere*); i. 3. 43 (noun qualified by both adjective and adverb); i. 4. 13 (*ingenuus color* = *albus color*); i. 4. 17 (the ellipse in *non impune feres*); i. 7. 7 (*ingenium* contrasted with *dolor*); i. 15. 29 (*sub pectore*); i. 16. 37 (the use of *toti* = *omnes*); ii. 4. 5 (*expenso gradu*); ii. 9. 45 (*ponet vestigia lecto*); ii. 13. 42 (*ad verum*); iii. 17. 12 (*utroque modo*); iv. 1. 101 (*Iunonis . . . votum*). There are also valuable notes on *Realien*, e.g. at ii. 12. 9 (deities represented wearing quivers) and at iv. 8. 45 (dice-playing with reference to *tali secundi*).

On the whole Shackleton Bailey is a conservative as regards the text, but paradoxically his defence of certain readings may increase scepticism where it existed or induce it where it did not. One feels that the last word has been said, but that the case fails nevertheless. Thus at i. 9. 13, after reading the author's just comment on *componere* that it means in effect 'do not compose', I think that emendation is required. Perhaps *propone* ('advertise for sale') is worth adding to earlier conjectures. Again at ii. 4. 19 the author does his best to justify the phrase *parvi litoris unda*, but in view of iv. 9. 60 *secreti limitis unda* (una O) I should now emend *litoris* to *limitis* in the earlier passage. For *limes* = 'channel' cf. also iv. 4. 50. Similarly at ii. 13. 52 Shackleton Bailey discusses the alternative renderings of *praeteritos*, viz. either 'dead' or 'former', and justly prefers the second, though noting that 'the use with an animate substantive is exceptional'. This is certainly true and in the context 'former' falls very flat. Propertius has been imagining his own early death and the example cited in 53-56 to support the statement made in 52 is Venus' fidelity to her lost Adonis. I suspect that *praeteritos* conceals a participle meaning 'taken away untimely' and suggest, for example, *praereptos*.

On the whole the author's powers lie more in exegesis than in emendation. In my text of 1953 I adopted his conjectures at i. 12. 2 and iv. 1. 117 and his brilliant transposition and punctuation of iv. 5. 63-66. He now suggests *poena* et for *poenae* at iii. 6. 20 and one is astonished that this simple remedy had not been thought of before. But most of the present suggestions (made very tentatively) are unconvincing. Here are some examples, with the text of the manuscripts given in brackets: i. 8. 14 *nec . . . auferat* (cum . . . auferet); i. 18. 27 *di magni* (*divini*); ii. 3. 22 *quae ullius* (*qu(a)e quivis*); ii. 22. 22 *curta* (*culta*); iii. 4. 17 *frena* (*tela*); iii. 6. 30 *clepta* (*tincta*); iii. 7. 47 *non tulerat Paetus* (*non tulit haec* [or *hoc*] *Paetus*); iii. 17. 33 *Thyiae* (*Thebae*); iii. 24. 11 *ab ipsa* (*et ipsa*); iv. 2. 2 *fatente deo* (*paterna dei*); iv. 4. 83 *custosque* (*festoque*). None of these has much palaeographical probability in view of the fairly well-defined types of corruption which are found in these manuscripts.

An adequate review of a book like this would require a volume almost as long as the original, but I must content myself with comments on a few more passages. At i. 14. 5 the author rightly says that the sense of *superne augeat* given to *intendat* by Scioppius and Enk needs the addition of, for example, *in caelum* and he would understand <*tibi*> *intendat*; on these lines *tibi tendat* might deserve consideration. At ii. 22. 39 his suggestion that *ministro* means in effect 'minion' may be right. At ii. 25. 17 he defends *sub limine* and thinks that the noun may here mean 'lintel'. But Ovid uses the phrase in connexion with a mouse-hole (*Fasti* ii. 573-4, 'sub limine ponit, / qua brevis occultum mus sibi fecit iter') and in Propertius acceptance of *sub crimine* (Langermann) seems desirable. On ii. 26. 57 Shackleton Bailey writes 'there is nothing strange in the simple loc. abl. after *ponere* ("upon your body")', of which probably the earliest example is i. 3. 22'. But there *ponere* means 'place', while here it means 'give up', and the examples quoted by the author show that with the latter meaning the preposition *in* is normally present. It is true that Propertius has two instances without *in*, ii. 13. 43 (not cited by Shackleton Bailey) and ii. 16. 3, but *primis cumis* and *saxo Cerauno* are far easier local ablatives than *tu corpore*. At iii. 8. 29-30 the author follows one of Burman's manuscripts and Phillimore in reading *Tyndaridis* instead of *Tyndaridi* and translates *gaudia ferre* 'reap joys', but the vulgate seems justified by Ovid, *Rem. A.* 728, 'hic mihi lasciva gaudia nocte dedit', and *ibid.* 777-8, 'hoc et in abducta Briseide flebat Achilles, / illam Plisthenio gaudia ferre toro'. At iii. 13. 39 *Idaei* (Volscus) gets some support from the mention of *nudae deae* in 38; cf. ii. 2. 13-14. At iv. 1. 51-52 I think that the description of Cassandra's prophecies as *sero rata* counts against the translation 'proved true in regard to the ancient Priam'. At iv. 2. 28 (*corbis in imposito pondere*) we are told that the use of the preposition is hardly bolder than in *Stat. Theb.* i. 712 or *Mart.* vii. 32. 9, but it is the presence of *imposito* which makes one doubt the reading. At iv. 5. 11 we read 'the witch's procedure seems similar to that of Medea as described by Ovid, *Met.* 7. 234 ff.' But there is nothing about *boiling* herbs in Propertius. The magic consists in causing the herbs to *move* from the Colline Gate to the trench prepared elsewhere. We are not told what the witch subsequently does with them. At iv. 6. 3 a good case is made for the retention of *cera*. At iv. 10. 42 the author favours *erectis*, a reading of *dett.*, and renders it 'lofty', which is hardly convincing. There is much to be said for *e Rhaetis* (Alton) in view of the connexion of the (Rhaetian) Gaesatae with Virōmarus and the mention of *gaesa* in this very line.

Shackleton Bailey has an enviable talent for succinctness. See, for example, his note on iii. 3. 21: 'O's reading (= praescripto sevecta est pagina gyro) is retained by most editors, who found it easier to add *sevehere* to their dictionaries . . . than a letter to Propertius' MSS.', or on iv. 4. 32: 'What damns *famosa* is its inability to combine intelligibly with *oculis meis*. Celebrity is not in the eye of the beholder; beauty notoriously is.' Altogether his style is admirably adapted to this kind of annotation.

Errors are few and far between. At i. 3. 16 Barth conjectured *amara* before Paley; at ii. 14. 30 the apparatus is in disorder; at ii. 23. 21 the reference to *Anth. Lat.* on p. 129 should be 382. 7.

Pp. 268-326 contain an appendix of further illustrative matter and pp. 319-26 furnish an index.

Exeter College, Oxford

E. A. BARBER

THE CIRIS

ARMANDO SALVATORE: *Studi sulla tradizione manoscritta e sul testo della Ciris*. i. *Fonti manoscritte e edizioni antiche*. (From *Rend. dell' Accad. di Archeologia: Lettere e Belle Arti di Napoli*, xxx.) Pp. 115. Naples: L'Arte Tipografica, 1955. Paper. ii. *Commentario et testo critico*. Pp. 156. Naples: Istituto Editoriale del Mezzogiorno, 1955. Paper.

The first part of this inconveniently arranged work consists of three chapters: (1) on the Graz fragment; (2) on Neapolitanus IV E 7 and Corsinianus 43 F 21; (3) on the Aldine edition of 1517 (with remarks on some others). In the examination of these sources many passages of the *Ciris* are discussed, so that the Commentary is in effect divided between the two parts.

The book is intended as a tract for the times. The critic of *Ciris* needs 'un *ubi consistam* riposto in un criterio, direi, di equilibrio linguistico . . . che dia la possibilità di vagliare serenamente le lezioni dei codici, antichi e recenti, le varianti delle edizioni umanistiche, gli emendamenti . . . Nessuna lezione o variante dovrebbe essere accolta o respinta, prima che sia stata esaminata alla luce di questo criterio. Io sono convinto che, seguendo tale principio . . . lo stato miserando in cui versa, assai spesso, il testo dei poemetti dell' *Appendix Vergiliana*, possa molto migliorare ed offrire alle future ricerche . . . una base più solida e una più sicura garanzia' (i. 102). This insistence on method, principles, criteria is hammered home in the little sermons on criticism which are scattered throughout the Commentary. In so far as it is not platitudinous, it strikes me as likely to mislead: editors of the *Culex* and *Ciris* say these things as a man will sing to himself on a dark and lonely road, to keep up their spirits. This text confronts the critic with two variables, the ineptitude of the poet and the vagaries of his scribes; one can make shift from one's experience to control the second, but not the first—Salvatore himself admits at one point (ii. 74) that there is no stylistic unity in the poem—and to use such terms as 'immaturità tecnica', 'tendenza stilistica', 'illogicità complessiva' not only does the poet too much honour but may delude the critic into believing that he has a principle to guide him when he ought to be depending on his wits.

So much by way of general criticism of Salvatore's approach; now to observe the critic at work. His examination of the manuscripts and editions is interesting (though I am always sceptical of the value of such partial examinations of a tradition), but his conclusions are sometimes dubious. Thus the alleged agreement of B^2 with G (i. 19) is without significance, since the agreement is in fact with GZ and the errors of B^1 are trivial and their correction easy. G 's authority is precious, but it may not be used at 413 (i. 38) to support *quam curius terris*: few errors are more common, even in good manuscripts, than *quam* for *qua*; and it is unscientific to assume at 472 (ii. 86) that *Sumius* must be right because it is in G —who is to say that G is not corrupt or interpolated here? The position of the Neapolitanus and the Corsinianus in the tradition is not made clear: the *Cors.* (so called; why not ' C '?) does not appear in the stemma at ii. 102, and I cannot see in what sense N is an 'intermediary' (i. 63, 65).

A natural result of the editor's confidence in method is that he rarely obelizes (only in fact at 90—oddly?—and 140); he is also by instinct conservative. Hence some things appear in his text which others besides myself may find it difficult to swallow: 12 *genus o Messala tuorum* (supported in the commentary

by examples of *decus saeculi*; by inadvertence? vv. 12-13 are quoted in the note with *genus*, directly followed by an approving citation of Helm's rendering 'die Zierde'; 79 *piscibus et canibusque malis*, with which compare the editor's correction of 477 *Aeginamque simulque salutiferamque Seriphon* and 532 *apposuitque*; 126 *cano* (no mention of *Amores* iii. 12. 21); 189 *scelere*; 288 *semper et aut olim*, etc. (*et* is said to be equivalent to 'e cioè, e propriamente'); 324 *per me, tua alumna* (even if one allows for the sake of argument that *alumna* can = 'nurse', is it likely that here and at 312 (i. 70-71) Carme should suddenly lapse from her heroics into the speech of Trimalchio and his friends?); 384 *Rhauci quod moenia crescant* (discussed at i. 10-12, but I find no convincing explanation of what this observation is supposed to mean in its context).

The second part seems to have been composed in haste: numerous misprints, not all corrected in the *Errata*; omissions from the apparatus at, for example, 32, 140, 229, 321, 340, 457 (what does *G* read here?), 497, and a muddle between commentary and text at 318. Corrections are reported strangely: 5 'quirit *post alios Bücheler*'; 12 'o Mes<sala tuorum> *post alios scripsi*'; cf. 47, 104, al. The omission of the names of Haupt and Heinsius from the apparatus at 350 and 450 is reprehensible.

Salvatore's scholarship and judgement are not contemptible: I have after all singled out only a handful of passages for criticism here, though I would quarrel with his choice in a good many more; but he often argues skilfully even where he is not convincing, and he is not woodenly conservative (he accepts conjectures in about three dozen places). All in all this is not by a long chalk the worst text of the *Ciris* one could name. But nowadays we have a right to demand more than this. Editing the Appendix is a serious—I had almost said grim—business: it is read mostly by professed scholars from a sense of duty (I except the *Copa* and the *Moretum* from these strictures), and we need a professional text. This Salvatore's work is not; it is an *opus tumultuarium*, and one which might well have been postponed *nomum in annum*. The world wants no more editions of the Appendix or its constituent poems unless they have some claim to be considered definitive.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

PHAEDRUS

ATTILIO DE LORENZI: *Fedro*. Pp. iv + 216. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1955. Paper, L. 900.

IN his introduction, Mr. de Lorenzi professes a sensible attitude and refers in suitable, if somewhat indulgent, terms to Mr. L. Herrmann's 'Phèdre et ses Fables' (*C.R.*, n.s. i. 182). It is, therefore, a surprise to find, before reading far, that this book is yet another exercise in the fashionable art of hariolation. The reader who has leisure and patience at his disposal will not withhold his admiration for the skill with which the precarious framework of hypothesis has been constructed. Indeed he should enter into the spirit of it and enjoy the fun. Scarcely a single proposition in the book is either impossible or certain; the whole is a romance strung together from such propositions, which are in general interdependent.

Of the poems of Phaedrus, some are Aesopean, some not. Of the latter, some

are fables, others anecdotes or personal statements in a cryptic manner. In each type of poem, and not least in the beast fables, the author discovers revelations about Phaedrus' experiences, which he weaves into a connected biography. He knows all the tricks. Some opinions are diffidently suggested (*forse, probabilmente, pare che, nulla esclude che, comunque, non possiamo esattamente indicare come*), others advanced with bluff assurance (*è ovvio che, sappiamo che, magari, quasi di evidenza matematica*); but it matters nothing, since the modest hypothesis soon reappears as established fact. Where even ghostly material for conjecture is lacking, the author is not embarrassed, but passes it off with an indifferent shrug—'ma di ciò non è rimasta traccia nella sua esperienza di poeta' (p. 84).

Here, then, is the beguiling and consistent biography for which we are indebted to de Lorenzi's ingenious imagination. Phaedrus was born at Pydna of Thracian parentage, about 18 B.C. (iii. Prol.). His mother was a harlot, who exposed him at birth because she wanted a girl to carry on the business (iii. 15). She left him at the door of a Greek professor, who gets off lucky with a mere hint of his paternity (pp. 40 and 52). The professor turns out to be Antipater of *Anth. Pal.* vi. 335. Antipater had an Athenian slave-woman, who suckled the infant (iii. 15) and taught him to recite Aesop with a refined pronunciation. L. Calpurnius Piso brought Antipater and the child, now about seven years old, to Rome. Here he presented him to Augustus, who appointed the handsome and cultured slave-boy (not, we are assured, a eunuch or an invert) as one of the *ministri* to Lucius Caesar (p. 55; the author's real reason for selecting the younger brother, viz. that the *ministri* of Gaius were liquidated by Augustus, and Phaedrus survived this event, is only allowed to creep in later). It was to this gift that Piso owed his *supplicatio*. After Lucius' early death Phaedrus (who had attended Verrius Flaccus' school) was attached to Agrippa Postumus (*App.* 10 and 22 refer!). After Augustus' death Phaedrus was transferred to the *uilla Misenensis* of ii. 5, which poem is made to prove that Phaedrus was a freedman by *alapa*, not *uindicta*. Here he wrote Books i and ii, the latter of which was arrested by Sejanus' inquisition; this explains its shortness. The *uiles nemias* of iii. Prol. is a quotation from the judgement. The manager of the *uilla* was Philetus of v. 10. He was also the *testis* of iii. Prol. 42. Philetus was replaced by Eutyclus (iii. Prol.), a well-meaning but ignorant Greek, and also the *asinarius* of Suetonius, *Aug.* 96. Eutyclus was later replaced by Particulo, a cultured Italian (iv. Prol.), the pun on whose name detected in *App.* 1. 5 is too good to be true. After Particulo's disappearance, Philetus returned, chastened and repentant, secured full enfranchisement for Phaedrus' son (hence *C.I.L.* vi. 20181), and had Book v grudgingly (for his name only appears at the end) dedicated to him. Under Eutyclus and Particulo Phaedrus had tried *paulo maiora canere* and, in particular, to rival Horace and refute the charge of excessive *breuitas* (iii. 10. 59-60).

We are also told why Martial mentioned Phaedrus (in *Mart.* iii. 20. 5 *locos* is restored, with, however, a nod of recognition for Heraeus' λόγους), while Seneca and Quintilian did not, and many other things, entertaining to read, but not always easy to believe.

CAESAR THE WRITER

SIR FRANK ADCOCK: *Caesar as Man of Letters*. Pp. x+115. Cambridge: University Press, 1956. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.

THERE is, on the one hand, the young schoolboy's and young schoolgirl's Caesar—not a book, but a hardly intelligible maze of complexity; and on the other hand there are profound scholarly researches into the veracity of what Caesar has recorded and into the problems of when he wrote, and when he published, and why. In between we have Hirtius' nice assessment of Caesar as a writer: 'erat autem in Caesare cum facultas atque elegantia summa scribendi, tum verissima scientia suorum consiliorum explicandorum' and the praise of the *commentarii de bello Gallico* in Cicero, *Brutus* 262, 'nudi enim sunt, recti et venusti, omni ornatu orationis tamquam veste detracta . . . : sanos quidem homines a scribendo deterruit'.

Sir Frank Adcock adds his voice to those of Hirtius and of Cicero. Fourth-form boys and girls read Caesar, sixth-form boys and girls do not. Nobody lectures on Caesar in Cambridge—though at Oxford perhaps they will; for by a happy coincidence there are rumours that Caesar, who can be read in two different pass examinations, may soon be elevated to a place among the authors studied in Honour Classical Moderations.

It was not *historia* that Caesar wrote, but *commentarii*; and the first chapter of this little book, which is concerned with this point, deserves careful study; for the argument, employed before now by scholars, that the absence of any introduction describing the background to Caesar's Gallic command in 58 or to his invasion of Italy in 49 suggests that in both cases Caesar has something to conceal, is a bad argument: *commentarii* do not waste time on introductions, but get down at once to brass tacks.

A brief sketch on the content of the *commentarii* which were certainly written by Caesar himself (*De bello Gallico* i-vii and *De bello civili* i-iii) is followed by a section on style and personality. Next comes a section called 'Certain Problems', which informs the reader, if he does not know already, what the problems are to which the profound scholarly researchers devote their attention. These are in the main the questions when Caesar wrote and—what is not the same thing—when and with what object the different books were published; also the closely related question of the veracity of much that he wrote. As Asinius Pollio pointed out before Caesar had been long dead, the books contain mistakes, some of them deliberate. Here and there (in the first book of the *De bello civili*, for instance) mistakes can be detected with certainty, in one case—ironically enough—by the evidence of a letter written by Caesar himself and preserved in Cicero's correspondence; and there is no doubt that Caesar goes too far in suggesting that the wilfulness of his enemies alone frustrated his own repeated efforts to secure a negotiated peace in 49 B.C. Distortions of truth in the *De bello Gallico* (such as Michel Rambaud and Gerold Walser have recently laboured to establish) are by no means so certain.

Sir Frank's own guarded conclusion, which he has not the space to argue at any length, is that 'on the whole it seems more probable than not that, while Caesar wrote the seven commentaries on the War in Gaul in stages, he published them all at once' in late 51 or 50 as the time of his candidature for a second consulship approached; and, as concerns their vaunted 'propaganda

value', he points out well that the reading public for which they were intended was a small one, consisting in the main of people of Caesar's own class in Rome. As for the commentaries on the Civil War, Sir Frank considers that, though they were written by Caesar soon after the events described, 'there is too great an element of doubt to permit a confident assertion that Books I and II were in fact published in 48 B.C.'

Finally he refers shortly to the question of the authorship of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, the *Bellum Africum*, and the *Bellum Hispaniense*.

There are a few references in footnotes to more exhaustive works of Caesarian scholarship but—and the fact is to be regretted—Sir Frank decided deliberately not to add a bibliography.

In his organization of, and contributions to, the *Cambridge Ancient History*, Sir Frank Adcock has already produced his κτῆμα ἐς αἰεὶ. Here, to illustrate his versatility, is his felicitous ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα.

Exeter College, Oxford

J. P. V. D. BALSDON

THE LOEB CAESAR

A. G. WAY: Caesar, *Alexandrian, African and Spanish Wars*. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xiv+426; 6 maps. London: Heinemann, 1955. Cloth, 15s. net.

THE final volume of the Caesarian corpus in the Loeb series is on a generous scale. After a brief general introduction and a chronological table, each *War* has its own short introduction and an analysis, and the *Alexandrian War* is conveniently prefaced by a summary of *Civil War* iii. 103–12. There are four appendixes, one on the operations near Uzitta of *B. Afr.* 37–66, the others respectively on *B. Hisp.* 6, 18, and 22. To three separate indexes of 'Persons and Places' is added a General Subject Index, and finally six fully 'thrown-out' maps are provided, an arrangement which would have benefited both previous volumes. In the text, chapters are not divided into sections.

On authorship the editor is discreet but perhaps inclines (p. ix) towards attributing the *B. Alex.* to Hirtius, and towards Nipperdey's suggestion that the other two accounts are rough drafts ordered by Hirtius for a subsequent redaction by himself which was never undertaken. The eight 'most important' manuscripts are listed (pp. ix, x); reference to Peskett's Introduction to the *Civil Wars* (Loeb, 1914) for discussion of their relationship is inadequate and overlooks the absence there of the *Neapolitanus*, nor can it be particularly helpful since Mr. Way's volume, like its two predecessors, unfortunately uses no *sigla*. Textual evidence is therefore not easily differentiated or assessed. At times Way gives variants, as for example, pp. 38, 168, 260 n. 2, 294 n. 3 (*M* only), 362 nn. 1 and 4, and usefully when vital to the narrative, as pp. 242 and 244. But he is not always a reliable guide. The following are only some of the textual notes which need revision: *B. Alex.* p. 50 Hoffmann deleted *cum* before *m. copius*; p. 86 add *eam LN*; p. 118 Nipperdey's 'reading' consists of six words suggested to fill a lacuna (contrast p. 148 n. 2); p. 122 '*quam MSS.*' (om. *LN*); *B. Afr.* p. 180 n. 2 '*VI all MSS.*' (*VII U*); p. 172 n. 1 'general reading of the *MSS.*' neglects omission of *quis* by *SLN*, *T*, of *in* by *V*, and its variant *non SN*; p. 238 n. 2 'most *MSS.*', but only *T* gives the initial *fere*; p. 240 n. 2 '*ac MSS.*'

pulsi Nipp. should read '*deserti ac pulsi MSS.; deserta pulsi Nipp.*'; p. 274 '*itata MSS.*' (S only); *B. Hisp.* p. 312 n. 1 'the MSS. reading . . . *pacis*' (*paucis ST*); p. 318 n. 2 *pontis* should be deleted, and *tripertito* is V only; n. 4 '*a avia MSS.*' (S only); p. 320 n. 3 *antiquas* (S only); p. 340 n. 4 *Catonem* so Klotz '*praeceunte Mommseno*', and Way clears the confusion (which concerns his own conjecture) on p. 401; p. 366 n. 2 add *differunt* S. Further difficulty arises from the *recentiones*. Peskett included in his *stemma* the manuscript Y (= Laurentianus II; 68. 6), a fact apparently overlooked by Way, who does not in his own introduction define the minor manuscripts. Hence such inadequacies as p. 116 n. 1, where they include the 'two MSS.' from which *venit* is derived, or p. 296 n. 2 '*logatis* most MSS.'—in fact 'all' by terminology elsewhere, since *irrogatis* comes from 'two inferior Dresden codices' (cf. 'two inferior MSS.', 'some late MSS.', pp. 330, 372 n. 2, 384 n. 3). Elsewhere the evidence of the *recentiones* is neglected, as p. 92 (inclusion of C = *centenos*), p. 316 (*dispositi*), p. 318 n. 3 (*alternis*).

The text of *B. Alex.* and *B. Afr.* here printed revives many conjectures, not all convincing, and on the whole seems neither so satisfying nor so well in keeping with modern trends as the recent Budé editions by the late M. J. Andrieu (1954: available to Way too recently for more than brief reference) and by M. A. Bouvet (1949) respectively. In the unenviable task of editing the *B. Hisp.*, exigencies of text have enabled the better judgement of the editor to prevail over the desires of the translator more frequently than elsewhere. Almost all the dozen or so lacunae which are accepted occur here; but even so the ingenious eclecticism of 32. 2 (Nipp., Oud., Hoffm.) and 41. 1 (Dint., Fleisch., Hoffm.), and the comment that 25. 7 defies 'plausible reconstruction' remind us of the earlier avoidance of the *obelus* and ready acceptance of emendations from a wide field. Way's own suggestion of *ut* (*et* codd.) *sup. locis* in *Alex.* 12. 1 is useful and his arguments (App. C) for three envoys in *Hisp.* 17-18 attractive, if one has full confidence in his *cum Catone* <*et Antonio*> (17 init.: *Lusitano* codd.) with <*introiit*> *Tib. T.* and Mommsen's C<*atonem*> *Antonius* (18 init.). In 24. 3 his valid objection to *planitie* seems better covered by *planitie* than in *planitiem* as printed. In several places his choice of the codices' reading may well be right, as, for example, *Alex.* 31. 3 (no lacuna), 43. 1 *ausuque*, 59. 1 *detraherunt*, or *Afr.* 35. 3 *verba*, 50. 3 *abusi*; but some linguistic points deserve reconsideration and a note, as, for instance, *Alex.* 78. 2 *regem Bosphori . . . qui* (Dinter: *quod* codd.) *sub imperio Ph. fuerat* (where Klotz compares *Hisp.* 41 fin. a *Munda quod*, accepted by Way without comment), *Afr.* 21. fin. *hac re nuntiata Caesar . . . disposuit* (*Caesari* codd. cannot be ruled out), 97. 3 *pondo* (Glandorp: *ponderis* codd. has strong claims).

The English translation is generally of high quality, in a refreshingly natural and lively style. Only occasionally does one notice a slip or a questionable rendering: *Alex.* 52. 2 *dato loco* 'when the chance offered'—perhaps rather 'when room was made' ('derrière R. qui . . . le laisser passer', Andrieu); 56. 4 and p. 101 n. 2 on *conventus* ('mot . . . délicat à traduire', as Andrieu says) need more precision in view of 57. 5 and 59. 1 *bis*; 64. 3 fin. *ostio fluminis, in ipsis faucibus* 'the river mouth' . . . 'in the very mouth of the river'; *Afr.* 26. 2 init. the translation suggests that only *commemorare* goes with *coeperunt* and that the other infinitives are historic; 40. 3 *f. restantes* (= S, TV) 'a gallant resistance' (= *resistentes N, MUR*); 84. 3 init. *armatus* 'the soldier'—cf. *miles* and *armatus* in the two previous sentences; *B. Hisp.* 16. 2 fin. *nocte tota ultra ibat flumen S. in acie* 'he spent the whole night on the move in battle formation on the far side

of the river S.' seems an improbable rendering; 22. 3 after lacuna, 'the men of Ursao' (cf. '*sc. Bursavonenses*' Klotz) should be in brackets; 29. 2 *planities* 'the plain ground'; 29. 8 *patrocinari loco iniquo* 'on the defensive on the steep ground' conceals the case of *loco*; 33. 2 and 4 *pugnare coeperunt, ipse de tempore cenare* 'they fell to fighting', 'he fell to upon the banquet'; 40. 1 lacuna in translation not shown in text.

Misprints include *Alex.* 30 fin. *sagittairis*, 35. 2 *differetur*, 37. 3 *suo more* transposed, 43. 2 *fidelissimi* (-que omitted), 44. 1 *gesta* (-ae), 70. 2 *missisent*, 74. 3 *militem* (-um?); *Afr.* 39. 1 *agmen* (*aciem*), 54. 4 *te* omitted before *removeo*; *B. Hisp.* 22. 4 *retulissent*, 32. 7 *bellum* (*belle*). The wording of pp. 236 n. 2, and 352 textual n. 3 needs revision.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne, University of Durham G. CLEMENT WHITTICK

COLUMELLA

E. S. FORSTER and EDWARD H. HEFFNER: *Columella, On Agriculture*. A recension of the text and an English translation. Vol. ii (Books v-ix): pp. xi+503. Vol. iii (Books x-xii, *De Arboribus*): pp. vii+435. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1955. Cloth, 15s. net each. ÅKE JOSEPHSON: *Columellae Rei Rusticae libri viii-ix*. (Columellae opera, fasc. v.) Pp. xix+117. Upsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1955. Paper, Kr. 15.

ÅKE JOSEPHSON: *Die Columella-Handschriften*. (Upsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1955: 8.) Pp. 181. Upsala: Lundequvist, 1956. Paper, Kr. 17.

THE first volume of the Loeb *Columella*, edited by Dr. H. B. Ash, was published in 1941 and reviewed in *C.R.* lvii. 28. The remainder of the work was entrusted to the late Professor E. S. Forster of Sheffield; it has been completed for publication by Dr. E. H. Heffner of the University of Pennsylvania, who says that he has made 'a thorough examination of every aspect of the work'. One is the more surprised to find *pene* (v. 7. 2), *tetris* (ix. 5. 2), *pyrum* (v. 10. 17), *pyri* (ix. 4. 3), and *quum* (viii. 14. 4) appearing in the text: these spellings are presumably due to using an antiquated text (and there was no other) to print from, but a thorough examination might have been expected to remove them.

The text is based on Lundström in the five books which he edited; for the others (v, viii, ix, xii) a text has been constructed on the basis of examination of the two early manuscripts (*S* and *A*) and the two fifteenth-century manuscripts which Lundström regarded as the most valuable (*a* and *c*). In the apparatus there are startling errors which should have been noticed by a reviser. v. 6. 18 '*vetustas Schneider*': ascribed by Gesner and Schneider to Broukhusius. v. 9. 3 '*immergere scripsi*, *immergeri* [a misprint] *Schneider*': Gesner had already printed *immergeri* and suggested *immergere*. v. 9. 8 '*pilae quae scripsi*': already in Gesner. v. 9. 9 '*confodere scripsi*': Schneider's correction. v. 10. 6 '*ventos quibus scripsi*': ascribed by Gesner and Schneider to Pontedera. v. 10. 8 '*nam ita vermibus interibunt scripsi ex libro de Arb.*': *vermibus interibunt* is already in Gesner. v. 11. 5 '*dimittito addidi ex libro de Arboribus*' (so text): *De Arb.* has *demittito* and *demittito* is already added in Gesner. vii. 3. 8 *sintque illa* text, '*sint quala Gesner, sint quola SAac*' app.: *sintque illa* is Gesner's conjecture and *sint*

quala is in the *ed. princeps*. vii. 4. 5 'quia *addidi*': added in Gesner, Schneider, Lundström. viii. 3. 1 '*orienti Schneider*': already in Gesner. ix. 13. 9 '*laetaturas scripsi*': already in Gesner and Schneider. xii. 21. 3 *quod* was proposed, according to Gesner, by Schoettgen (and in any case idiom calls for Schneider's *quae*). xii. 49. 10 *exinanari* text, '*exinanari scripsi*': *exaniari S*: *examari a c* app.: *exinanari* is a *vox nihili* (is *exinaniri* meant?) and the vulgate *ex(s)aniari* is clearly right. xii. 28. 2 *effluat* text, '*effluat Warmington*' (and nothing more) app.: the manuscript reading (*fluat*) is not mentioned, and *effluat* was anticipated in Gesner's note. At xi. 2. 81 Schneider's *in flore*, at xi. 3. 50 Lundström's *cucumeres* is printed without any note, though elsewhere the apparatus records such trivialities as *chorus* for *corus* and *habarius* for *aviarius*. At viii. 3. 6 *praedictis* text, '*praedictis SAac*' app. defies interpretation.

In Book viii, where Columella has much to say about hatching, the manuscripts sometimes show forms of *excudo*, sometimes forms of *excludo*. There is reason to believe that in the meaning 'hatch out' *excludere* came to poach on the province of *excudere* and finally (teste *éclore*) ousted it. It is possible (though perhaps not very likely) that Columella used both verbs; it is not likely that he used *excudere* five times in Chapter 14 and *excludere* eighteen times in the rest of the book, but that is what he is made to do. There is no evidence that *excutio* was a third rival, but in its participle it is often confused in manuscripts with *excudo*: at viii. 15. 7 *excussi* is printed without comment, although at viii. 14. 7 the same mistake has been corrected. Another technical term of the farmyard is *inciens*, whose rare occurrences in literature copyists have made rarer by turning it into *inciens* or *incipiens*: at vii. 3. 16 Ursinus's *inciens* is accepted for *incipiens* of the manuscripts, but at viii. 11. 8 their *incipientes* is preferred to his *inciens*.

The translation in general is accurate and neat; its idiomatic quality is so well maintained that 'rather often' for *saeptus* (xi. 1. 20), 'by one half earlier' for *dimidio maturius* (xi. 1. 16) and 'effused by vices' (whatever that may mean) for *vitiis plectectus animus* (xi. 1. 14) come as a surprise. But there are places where the translator has slipped. v. 1. 8 *pro quibus nulla merces dependitur* is not 'on which no business transaction depends' but 'for which no rent is paid'; vi. pr. 3 *ulla regio in qua modo frumenta gignantur* is not 'any region in which nothing but cereals is grown'; vii. 3. 7 *glaber et exiguus* is obviously not 'a small and hairless ewe'; vii. 3. 18 is mispunctuated and misunderstood; vii. 4. 1 *universum genus lanigerum* is not 'all the sheep which are kept for their wool' but 'the whole class of woolly animals' (opposed to *aliae pecudes*); vii. 5. 17 *Bolus Mendesius* came from Mendes, not from 'Mendesium'; viii. 2. 7 *omnes huius coloris* is not 'of that colour all over'; viii. 15. 7 *haud dubitanter progenerant* is not 'undoubtedly breed'; viii. 15. 5 *desiderant esse quo irreperant* is not 'require to be where there is a hole into which'; viii. 17. 6 *repraesentare* is not 'represent' but 'reproduce'; ix. 4. 7 *ex sordidis* is not 'from dirty feeding-grounds' but 'of the despised varieties'; xi. 47. 5 *vestimenta forensia* are not 'official robes' but 'outdoor clothes'; xii. pr. 6 *simplex natura* is not 'nature in her simplicity' but (as Xenophon shows) 'the single sex' (and Schneider's *valebat* for *volebat* is necessary); xii. pr. 8 *flagrabat mulier pulcherrima aemulatione* is not 'the most beautiful of women was fired by emulation'—a singularly inconsequent remark (*pulcherrima* is ablative); xii. 12. 1 *fructum conficere* is not 'prepare fruit' (Columella is talking about cheese; cf. xii. 3. 9); xii. 45. 5 the *novi limites*, the making of which the bailiff is to prevent, are not 'boundaries'. The point of *ut quaeque* seems to be missed at xi. 2. 47, of *tamen* at xii. 3. 10, of *vix unus* at xii. 52. 3.

Latinists will be grateful for a complete, convenient, modern Columella, but it is a pity that the revision was not more thoroughly done.

The Upsala edition which Lundström began, and of which four fascicles appeared over the years from 1897 to 1940, has happily found a continuator in Mr. Josephson. His apparatus is even fuller than Lundström's; for he has examined forty-one of the renaissance manuscripts (R) and exhibits the readings of thirty-three of them. A great many of the variants which he thus records are of no value or interest in themselves: the evidence which they give on the relationship of the manuscripts and the history of the text he examines in *Die Columella-Handschriften*. The two ninth-century manuscripts, S and A, are independently descended from the same archetype, S being the more faithful while A, which he identifies with the manuscript brought from Germany by Poggio, is more careless and more given to attempting correction of a corrupt text. The R manuscripts are derived from a source other than the archetype of SA, but some of them—particularly the group containing *a*, whose value is correspondingly reduced—can be shown to have been contaminated from A, or a text akin to A. On the other hand one group of them (Lundström's *γ*-group), and especially the Bononiensis (*t*), seems to preserve some genuine readings from a source other than that of the rest of R: how this has come about there is not enough evidence to say.

University of Glasgow

C. J. FORDYCE

GREEK DIALECTS

CARL DARLING BUCK: *The Greek Dialects*. Pp. xiii+374; 2 charts. Chicago: University Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1955. Cloth, 90s. net.

SOME years ago all those whose studies, whether linguistic, literary, or historical, are in any degree concerned with Greek dialectology were dismayed by the news that C. D. Buck's *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects* was not to be reprinted. Our indebtedness is on that account all the greater not only to the author himself for revising the work, but to the University of Chicago Press, which has taken over responsibility for it from the former publishers.

The plan of the book, unlike its title, is unchanged, owing to the author's conviction, which should meet with general assent, 'that the arrangement adopted here is not only more economical of space, but also more illuminating, than the separate treatment of the several dialects followed in other works'. Not only has the general plan been kept, but in Part i (Grammar of the Dialects) the numbering of the main sections has been strictly preserved, sometimes at the cost of an incongruity, as when feminine *oi*-stems are appended as a note to masculines in -εὐς (111a). The old sections 200 and 269 have been abolished in order to free their numbers for new paragraphs on the characteristics of Pamphylian and Cyrenaean respectively. The 'Notes and References' have been much reduced by the transfer of most of their contents to the body of the book. Of the four charts which summarized the distribution of the chief dialect peculiarities only the first two remain, perhaps because the facts contained in the others were less clear evidence for the relationship of the dialects. More to be regretted is the omission of all bibliographies for the separate dialects. The

note that 'The majority of these (monographs) are now antiquated' does not justify the omission of the up-to-date minority.

Changes of detail are so numerous that only a few samples can be given. There are in the first place many noteworthy additions. A substantial contribution of new facts comes from Pamphylian (which now receives equal treatment with other dialects in Part i, but is still not represented by texts in Part ii) and Cyrenaean. There are new paragraphs on secondary *i* before *σ*+consonant (added, in order to keep the numeration, as a note to section 20 on interchange of *i* and *υ*); on alleged Cretan *κη* for *καί* (26a; the proposed remedy is the lesser of two evils); on dissimilation of vowels (46. 2; but *εἶπον*, *αἰδω*, being common Greek, have no right to a place in a book on the dialects); on the forms of the dual (104. 9-11); on thematic forms of contracting presents in Aeolic (157b) and on verbs in *-ᾶω* (159); on compounds in *-(ε)ργός* / *-(ε)οργός* (167) which would have been better still with a reference to Linear B evidence. The summaries of characteristics of some dialects, e.g. Phocian (230) and Argolic (250), are considerably augmented. Additional texts, at least fifteen, have been well chosen both for their linguistic importance and the interest of their subject-matter. No. 53, however, a Delphic text, adds little to the linguistic information contained in the rest of the selection; Buck gives only the first eighteen lines, cutting it short in the middle of a sentence (*τῶδε* in line 18 should be *τὸ δέ*). There are numerous additions and other changes to the notes on the texts. A special interest may be felt in the references to the language of the Linear B texts, both of which appear to have been last-minute additions made after the rest of the book was in type (p. 8, n. 8; sect. 68. 3a). These are preoccupied with the labio-velars and require some recasting; it is not the *voiceless* labio-velar stop alone that is preserved, nor is there good reason for saying that the preservation in texts of the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries of sounds originally, and perhaps at that very period, common to all the dialects 'lines up with' a peculiar development of those sounds in Arcadian and Cyprian texts of the sixth and fifth centuries. The omissions are also interesting. They include the former attribution of West Greek *η*, *ευ* from *εα*, *εο* to Ionic influence, the note on the effect of the accent on contraction, the old explanations of Locrian *φῶτι* and Cyprian *ὄπι σίς κε*. The loss of a few short texts is more than offset by the additions. Some corrections and changes of opinion are the result of new evidence or further reflection. Among these the explanation of Heracleian fut. *-σονται* as from *-σεοντι*, foreshadowed in the old 'Notes and References', is very plausible; the re-estimates of *γεγράφεται* and especially of *μεμαθωσάνται*, now taken (as by Schwyzler, *Gr. Gr.*, p. 118) as a future perfect subjunctive, are perhaps not so straightforward as they appear to Buck. In the commentary on the Locrian text No. 57 and in section 89 *ἐδέμω*, etc., are understood as phonetic, not merely orthographic, simplifications. In No. 67, lines 2 and 24, *ἄματα τὸμ πάντα χρόνον* is now explained as 'a blend of the old formulaic *ἄματα πάντα* with the current *τὸμ πάντα χρόνον*'; this, like some other changes of opinion, is a transference of allegiance from one to the other of two views both existing at the time of the earlier edition. The partial translations of the texts needed and have undergone little revision. In No. 19. 14 'be excused from' is clearly more to the point than 'withdraw from'. Vollgraft's translation is adopted for the difficult No. 80, but with justified caution.

Apart from these and many similar changes, a number of interesting and controversial points will occur to the reader. In general Buck's aim is rather to

record than to explain; but it might have been worth while to point out (42. 5b) that the change of $\epsilon\omicron$ in some dialects to $\epsilon\omega$, ω implies consonantization of the ϵ/ι , with compensatory lengthening of the following vowel. In 49 many vocalic phenomena ($\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\nu$ by $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\nu$, etc.) are ranged under vowel-gradation, though some of them can be explained also by assimilation or other phonetic processes. Assimilation is indeed suggested as an alternative explanation of Arc. $\Pi\omicron\sigma\omicron\iota\delta\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (49. 1), and is to be preferred in view of Linear B evidence. In the old edition Arg. $\phi\upsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ for $\nu\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ was explained reasonably, even if without certainty, as 'arising from consonantal pronunciation of the υ '; the present edition may or may not mean the same by saying (52c) that it 'represents a dissyllabic pronunciation' (is the word not always a dissyllable, whether pronounced $h\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ or $h\upsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$?). To say that a spirant pronunciation of θ is implied 'probably by El. $\sigma\sigma = \sigma\theta$ ' (63) is to make short work of a complicated problem, in view of the intervening stage $\sigma\tau$; contrast the fuller treatment in the old edition. In 78 the discussion of the phonetic value of early Elean accusatives in $-as$, $-os/-op$ and their relation to later $-ais/-aip$, $-oip$ takes no account of the dative in $-op$ of No. 63 and Schwyzler 414. This is called in the notes on the text 'confusion of acc. and dat. forms'; but what is the cause of their confusion, if not some degree of phonetic similarity between them? Dissimilatory loss of the labial element in the labio-velars does not, as asserted in section 88, account for $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\varsigma$ from $-\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma$ unless it be in combination with a metathesis from $*-\rho\omicron\kappa\omicron\varsigma$; but even so the labial element is still present in $a\text{-}lo\text{-}\rho\omicron\text{-}qo$ of the Pylos tablets, as well as in its phonetically regular continuant $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\phi\omicron\varsigma$. The paragraph on the middle endings $-tai$, $-νται$ (139) takes no account of the views advanced by M. S. Ruipérez, *Emerita*, xx (1952), 8 ff. In 164. 4 Elean $\theta\epsilon\theta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ is quoted without comment, whereas some editors have thought it an error (e.g. Schwyzler $\theta\epsilon\theta(\tau)\mu\omicron\nu\varsigma$); if an error, is it not rather for $\theta\epsilon\theta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ (cf. Locr. $\tau\epsilon\theta\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ with Meillet's note, *Rev. de Phil.* liv. 185 ff.)? In section 173 and the notes on No. 19 $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (misquoted in the note as $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$) is called an accusative absolute, whereas it is an example of a case in a comparative clause determined by the case of the corresponding noun in the main clause. In No. 23 it is not clear why $\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha$ must be a feminine abstract rather than a neuter plural of the adjective; $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\rho\acute{\upsilon}\xi\acute{\epsilon}$ in the same text is explained as 'from $*\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\rho\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omega =$ Att. $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ' without any comment on the υ (assimilation of wi to $\acute{\upsilon}$). There are a few other forms which do not receive the comment they deserve: e.g. $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\iota$ (No. 34), $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\upsilon\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu$ (No. 36), $\acute{\alpha}[\pi]i\sigma\epsilon\tau\eta$ (No. 42). The reviewer has noted about fifty misprints, mostly quite trivial, a few likely to cause some passing bewilderment. One possibly serious mistake results from the revision: in section 182 the list of Ionic characteristics has been renumbered, but the sentence 'Some few of these are Ionic only (notably 1, also 8, 9, 14, 20, 22)' has not been changed to correspond (read '... also 9, 10, 15, 21, 23'), and a reference is kept to a now abolished paragraph 75b.

Considering the book as a whole, it is a matter for some regret that the new edition reflects unchanged a somewhat old-fashioned conception of dialect and dialect-relationship. In particular there is no appreciation of the very different evidential value of unchanged inherited forms on the one hand and of innovations on the other. It is, however, difficult to avoid a sense of ingratitude in uttering any criticism of a book which, in this as in former editions, is a work of admirable scholarship and soundness of judgement. The number and nature of the changes it has undergone justify the claim made in the preface that it is

'the most up-to-date treatment of the subject'; another claim they happily do not justify, that it is 'virtually a new book'. For its essential sameness as much as for its many improvements its admirers will be sincerely thankful.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

THE GREEK SUPERLATIVE

HOLGER THESLEFF: *Studies on the Greek Superlative*. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, xxi. 3.) Pp. 122. Helsinki: Academic Bookstore (Copenhagen: Munksgaard), 1955. Paper.

In his *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek*, published a few months before this book, Mr. Thesleff treated the superlative very briefly in three or four pages. The general principles outlined in the earlier book are now considered in detail, and for this purpose several technical terms, mainly of the author's own coinage, have been introduced. These are defined in the opening pages. When the superlative suggests a range of comparison or a point of culmination it is called 'culminative'. Thesleff distinguishes various categories of this type. When a wide range of comparison is implied the superlative is termed 'high-culminative', or if the range has no limit, 'all-culminative' (e.g. 'most of all'). The absolute superlative ('very', 'extremely'), which implies no comparison, is described as 'elative'.

Thesleff's main object is to see how far one can distinguish a purely 'elative' superlative in early and classical writers, and to discover how this type originated. For this purpose the various meanings of the superlative in the different branches of literature and their chief representatives are examined in detail. It is recognized that classification on a semantic basis is difficult, because there are many intervening stages between an unambiguous 'very' and an unambiguous 'most of all'. Determination of the meaning often depends on the context and is to a great extent subjective. Basing his analysis on this assumption Thesleff tries to define as objectively as possible the different shades of meaning which the superlative has in the various writers.

The results, it must be admitted, are somewhat bewildering to the reader; a typical example would be the description 'hyperbolic all-culminatives without clear indication of a range of comparison, which may be called elatives, if we assume that the meaning of culmination has faded'. It is inevitable that in many cases one should disagree with his classification. To take one example, he describes the superlative in *ἔθνη γὰρ πλείστα δὴ ἐπὶ μίαν πόλιν ταύτην ἐννήλθε* (Thuc. vii. 56. 4) as 'elative-like'; this is surely 'culminative', as it implies comparison with the past. In general, however, his attempts at interpreting the exact meaning are sensitive and penetrating. Certain superlatives are regarded as special cases and treated separately; the most important of these is *μάλιστα*, and superlative expressions involving *μάλιστα*.

Although Thesleff devotes his final chapter to a summary of his conclusions, the results of his investigations are not easy to grasp. His main argument runs something like this. In classical writers the 'elative' superlative never became an unambiguously distinct category free from all associations with the idea of 'culmination'. From Homer onwards, however, superlatives are found which

show only vague indications of a range of comparison and have a tendency towards an 'elative' meaning; it was from these that the 'elative' superlative developed. These 'elative-like' superlatives were employed for stylistic effect in the lyric encomium and in tragedy. In Aristophanes two categories of this type can be distinguished: (a) the superlative used as an attribute with a pathetic force which shows its connexion with its use by earlier poets, (b) the adverbial superlative which shows the influence of colloquial speech. In prose-writers an 'elative' meaning is less common than in poetry, but its frequency varies considerably in different writers.

This book, like its predecessor, shows careful and accurate scholarship, a sensitive judgement of the finer shades of meaning, and indefatigable industry on the part of its author. Some interesting points emerge about the use of the superlative by individual writers, and the main conclusion seems convincing. It does, however, seem that the book serves a much less useful purpose than the earlier study in intensification. The conclusions in themselves are neither definite enough nor important enough to justify the enormous amount of work involved in deducing them. As a work of reference its value is limited because superlative meanings do not admit of scientific classification. Judged as a whole it lacks unity and the various lines of argument are difficult to follow. Thesleff clearly has an excellent command of English, but in this book his exposition lacks clarity. This is only partly due to the nature of his subject. Technical language is inevitable in any work of this nature, but here it is overdone. Many statements could have been expressed more simply and more effectively without much loss of conciseness. One is, however, left with the conviction that the author is a very good scholar, with a fine feeling for nice distinctions of meaning.

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne,
University of Durham

H. LL. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

GREEK INSCRIPTIONS

Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Vol. xi, fasc. 2, ed. J. J. E. HONDIUS, Vol. xii, xiii, ed. A. G. WOODHEAD. Pp. 81-260; 172+ix; 186+xv. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1954, 1955, 1956. Paper, fl. 27.50, 31.50, 36.

THE desirability or otherwise of continuing the publication of *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* after the unexpected death in 1950 of Dr. J. J. E. Hondius, its founder and editor, has been much debated, and nothing is gained by carrying the debate further. Publication has restarted under the editorship of Mr. A. G. Woodhead of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and though some may hold that this mechanical repetition of texts, many of which have been well and finally published in an accessible form elsewhere, is unnecessary, few would maintain that it does sufficient harm to warrant a campaign in favour of its cessation. In the circumstances, then, the task of a reviewer is simply to assess the quality of the editor's work within the given premisses. How well has he done the job he set himself is now the only relevant question. In attempting to answer it, I shall say nothing of the first of the three parts under review, namely *S.E.G.* xi. 2, since this was already in the press when Hondius died, and may be regarded as the last product of the old régime. Woodhead has decided to return to the original plan of Hondius, and republish annually the inscrip-

tions published in the previous year, whatever the provenance may be. This is a good plan, and it is to be hoped that conditions will permit him to keep to it.

The greatest part of the editorial work, both in labour and in quantity, consists in copying out the texts from other publications, and there is not much room for error, other than typographical, here. The reviewer, therefore, is bound to confine his attention mainly to the details in the lemmata and the notes to the various inscriptions. Detailed criticism of this kind is inevitably tiresome. However, it is unavoidable in reviewing editorial work.

I discuss first the substance of these lemmata and notes in both volumes. One general, and serious, criticism must be made of the notes. It was the custom of Hondius and his collaborators to publish in their notes their own conjectures and restorations for the inscriptions republished, and, speaking for myself, I find these conjectures, etc., by far the most valuable part of *S.E.G.*, and it is for these that I mainly turn to it. An essential of this method of brief annotation is that the authorship of such conjectures should be clearly stated, and Hondius thus indicated the conjectures of the original editor, when he did not accept them into the text, by 'ed.', and that of his colleagues by their names. His own suggestions were usually clearly indicated by an interrogative. Woodhead has accepted the principle of short annotation, but has carried it out in a very confusing manner. The word 'ed.' is almost never employed, and the question-mark, the normal indication of an editorial conjecture, is employed for all conjectures. Thus, for example, in xii. 2-3, the lemma reads 'a vss. 1/2 fort. [κ]ῆ[ρυν]|κας: δ[ε] || 5/6 *ημεδμν*[a τρία]? || 12 post τὸν, ὁ[λειζόνων]? c vs. 3 *Εἰ*[μολπιδ - -]?', all of these conjectures being due to the original editor, Dr. L. H. Jeffery. Again, *ibid.* 72, the note reads 'Cf. *IG*, i², 950, vss. 136/7, ubi το[χρ]όται | [β]άρβαροι legendum est', a correction which is due to Pritchett and Charbonneaux, and was published by Meritt. Again, *ibid.* 175, 'An Dionysius idem qui pater Asclepiadis ephebi a. 145/6^p in *IG*, ii², 2052 vs. 65 apparet?' also reproduces the observation of the first editor. Examples of this could be multiplied indefinitely (cf. *ibid.* 158, 311, 377, 388(!), 559, xiii. 3, 87, 181(!); sometimes, e.g. xii. 472, the restorations could be attributed to any one of three persons). Now, if it were possible to say that *all* the supplements, etc., were derived from the first editors, and we could proceed on this assumption, there would be little difficulty, but, in fact, Woodhead does make some conjectures of his own, and they are not distinguished from those of the original editors; thus the element of doubt remains. (For examples of notes due to Woodhead see xiii. 226, where for Scranton's [*Πηγύ*]λα, ἡ βουλῆσε *Τύχην* ὡς εἰ λάσκουσα he proposes 'εἰλάσκουσα?', a remarkable suggestion; *ibid.* 265, 374). Consequently every conjecture has to be checked and examined carefully in respect of authorship, and this, in turn, means that the work can only be effectively used in a library—where, in any case, the original editions are available.

Another serious defect, on a larger scale, concerns the selection of material by the editor. As I have already said, one may object to his principle of including in *S.E.G.* some collections of inscriptions well published elsewhere. However, *in se*, this, if waste of editorial time, does no harm. It is more disconcerting to find that he has himself chosen to omit some of the texts from series reproduced here by him, and to include others as 'potiores'. Two instances of such selection occur in connexion with inscriptions of Beroea and Caunus,

xii. 319-31 and 418-60 respectively. From Cormack's two publications of tombstones from Beroea, *B.S.A.* xli (1940-5), pp. 325-31, and *Hesperia*, xlii (1944), pp. 23-29, a total of thirty-five inscriptions, Woodhead gives us the 'potiores'. From the first article, containing twenty-six inscriptions, he reprints only six (nos. 14, 15, 18-20, 22), and from the second article, with nine inscriptions, he reproduces seven (1-7). From Bean and Cook's article containing inscriptions from Caunus, he publishes forty-two out of fifty-nine. This seems a dangerous procedure. It is impossible to determine the 'importance' of a text, however fragmentary, once and for all, since it may at any moment become significant in the light of material subsequently published. Further, and more immediately relevant, these two collections of texts are sufficiently large, and sufficiently homogeneous, to have statistical value, for instance in regard to the use of names. How can such groups of texts be studied in part? I have the impression that Woodhead did not clearly visualize the various ways in which such groups of texts may be utilized as groups. (It may be noted in passing that his interpretation of 'potiores' sometimes needs definition: see xiii. 429, 430, 435; if these are 'potiores', others, omitted, are no less so.)

Finally, the style and the language of the lemmata. These are, as under the old régime, composed in Latin. The arguments for and against the continued use of Latin as a language of learning continue to be advanced by their partisans, and I have no wish to take sides. It would be agreed in any case that the value of the use of Latin in lemmata lies in its use as a code: accepted phraseology, combined with the natural brevity of Latin, makes it particularly useful in this respect. Once, however, the stereotyped formulae of the Latin are abandoned, once the same thing is expressed in more than one way, the practical value of its use is greatly diminished, since the problem of interpretation arises. Hondius was very meticulous in this respect, and was, in addition, like most Dutch scholars, familiar with free composition in Latin. His lemmata, it may fairly be said, were exemplary.

I speak, confessedly, as one to whom Latin composition never came readily, and I therefore judge not as a practitioner but as one who has tried using Woodhead's lemmata. As such, I find myself compelled to say that his Latin is often ambiguous, and sometimes simply ungrammatical. I give some examples. First, the latinization of proper names. This is always a difficult subject, in the absence of established rules, but consistency and avoidance of ambiguity are, in any case, essential. Yet, I find the following: xii. 15, 'non esse coniungendum monet Mable Lang apud Meritt'; *ibid.* 44 'De supplementis Merittii'; *ibid.* 17, 'cum Olivero artissime congruit', 'argumenta Oliveri et Oswaldi respuit', but, *ibid.* 94, 'Textum Oliverii transcripsimus', all referring to J. H. Oliver; xiii. 69, 'Προεύς Kirchner, sec. Pittakis et Ross: Προβούς Koehler, sec. Koumanoudes': here there is a real ambiguity in the error since Pittakis, Ross, and Koumanoudes are the objects and not the subjects of 'sec(utus)'. There are many other examples. Another feature of his Latinity is the use of rare and unfamiliar expressions for perfectly satisfactory familiar ones. Thus, the Latin for a modern newspaper is recognized to be *ephemeris*, but he prefers the unnatural 'acta diurna', e.g. xii. 166, 'ex actis Athenarum diurnis Καθημερινή', cf. *ibid.* 349, 'ex actis Thessalonicae diurnis Φῶς' (although *ibid.* 354 'nuntiant acta diurna Thessalonicae *Ellenike Vorra* . . . et Athenarum *Vima* . . . atque *Apoyeufmatine*', with the names of the newspapers

transliterated).¹ Another most unexpected phrase is found in xii. 420, 'nunc Karakoy in ecclesia Islamica'! Here the Latin form 'moschea' is perfectly in order (see *S.E.G.* viii. 173, 276), and there is no excuse for the solecism. We may further note the use of 'inscriptio', and not 'titulus', for a single inscription, e.g. xii. 84, 124, 146, 354, etc., whereas 'titulus' for its part occurs with an unexpected meaning in the lemma to xii. 314, 'annum quo titulum *Βασιλεὺς* assumpsit Demetrius II . . .'. The use of abbreviations is also often confusing. Thus 'invent(us)', 'found', is often abbreviated to 'inv.', causing confusion with 'inv.' the normal abbreviation for 'inventory number'. The usual, but not invariable, habit of Hondius was to put the name of the place of discovery in the locative without a verb, and it is obvious that, if a verb is employed, 'reperitus' is better than 'inventus', in view of the ambiguity of the latter. Woodhead has, for instance, in xii. 82, 'In Agora inv. (Ag. inv. P. 18276)' which one might justifiably take as an unintentional diplography. Another instance of a single abbreviation for two different words is 'rest.', which can mean both 'restitutio' (xii. 29, though the more normal 'supplementa' also occurs, *ibid.* 27), and 'restituit' (e.g. *ibid.* 84). Of course, some of these ambiguities are not serious, but even the least slow up one's reading and at times leave one uncertain as to meaning.

In the aggregate these points constitute an undeniable charge against the clarity, and hence the usability, of the lemmata and the notes, and it is on these that Woodhead must be judged.

Whoever reads Woodhead's preface to xii will realize that the task of editing these fascicules has cost him much labour, and it would be churlish not to express recognition of this fact. At the same time the editorial standard must evidently be raised if the work is to serve its purpose, and we must all hope that the many academic duties to which he refers in the preface will allow him more time for this undertaking.

All Souls College, Oxford

P. M. FRASER

THE EARLIEST CULTURES OF GREECE

FRITZ SCHACHERMEYR: *Die ältesten Kulturen Griechenlands*. Pp. 300; 16 plates, 78 figs., 11 maps. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1955. Cloth, DM. 18.

By the 'earliest' cultures of Greece Dr. Schachermeyr means those that precede the Middle Bronze Age. He intends to cover Middle Helladic and Mycenaean in a later volume. Readers of *C.R.* who 'know' that Middle Helladic opens with the arrival of the 'first Greeks' in Greece, and still more those who leave even Mycenaean Greece to 'prehistorians', may therefore think that this book is not for them; but it is for both. It is an attempt to synthesize and interpret the growing mass of knowledge about these earliest ages of Greece. The author is well aware, and from the start makes his reader well aware, of the limitations imposed by his material: as we extend historical inquiry backward the evidence becomes scantier and harder to interpret; yet it is the major phenomena that do leave their mark, and the task is therefore not hopeless.

¹ For the interchange of modern Greek and Latin forms, compare also xii. 188, 190, 206, where modern street-names are ren-

dered by 'Via', e.g. 'Via Callisthenis', 'Via St. Constantini', etc., with *ibid.* 192 'n. 6 δδ. Βασιλικῶν', xiii. 66, '16 δδ. Πανός'.

He admits that the simplicity of our conclusions from archaeology may be misleading: our resultant concepts of cultural influences and trends are perhaps in the nature of metaphors. But every good worker on the frontiers of a science knows, as Plato knew, that this is no cause for pusillanimity in the formation of an hypothesis; and in classical studies too it is the formulation of the best hypothesis, rather than ingenuity in defending it against a later access of superior evidence, that is the mark of useful research.

By going back to the earliest ages Schachermeyr gets away from the false question: 'Who (or when) were the first Greeks?' To label as Greeks the people who entered Greece at the beginning of Middle Helladic is to imply some identity with those who built the Erechtheum—though we know by their fruits they were different; and it is to ignore those other non-Greek (and non-I.E.) parents of the Greek race who already in the Early Bronze Age superimposed their culture on a yet earlier, neolithic, Greece. How far back does present knowledge allow us to push the inquiry? Our evidence consists almost entirely of pottery and other artifacts, the development and affinities of which are at present but rarely assisted by the conclusions of physical anthropology in the deduction of the origins of their makers. From a wide survey of archaeological material Schachermeyr draws a picture of a *Vorderasiatische Kulturtrift* in which the advances starting from a basic change from food-gathering to food-producing societies, beginning in the Middle East, may be traced westward to the Aegean and the Danube. It is to this large cultural province that the earlier neolithic of Sesklo (and other Greek sites) belongs. The neolithic of Crete is distinguishable from it, but not entirely without points of contact. Stimulated by this westward drift, there arises in the lower Danube area the vigorous *Bandkeramik* culture, which develops its own sphere of influence all over the Balkans, extending perhaps into Italy, and backward into Greece, where it is responsible for the striking Dimini culture of Thessaly. (Whether a *Bandkeramik* influence may also be traced in the Cyclades Schachermeyr leaves an open question.) His closer localization of the origins of the Dimini phenomenon in the cultures of Bük, Theiss, and Westsieberbürgen is not without rivals among those who have studied the archaeology of the lower Danube basin. The present reviewer cannot judge; but he feels that the location of Dimini itself and the diffusion of Dimini pottery within Thessaly suggest an arrival of invaders by sea rather than by land, even if they do come ultimately from some part of the *Bandkeramik* area. In any case the Dimini phenomenon does not affect all of Greece, and is seen by Schachermeyr rather as one of several reinfusions into parts of the Aegean of cultural elements originally derived from the east, though now combined with features that have been developed in Europe.

Far more important, and hardly now disputable, is the community of culture in the subsequent Early Bronze Age between Anatolia and the whole Aegean. It was in Crete that the progress due ultimately to the Near East's discovery of metal-working had its most independent results, in the brilliant Early Minoan civilization; Mainland Greece was less original in its adaptation of the new ideas and techniques; but it is still fair to regard the Greece of this period as the 'younger but gifted brother of the east'.

Such were the origins of the substratum on which, early in the second millennium B.C., there impinged the I.E. invaders whose westward advance is nowadays recognized in the first establishment of Luvians and Hittites in

Anatolia, in the new set-up of Troy VI, in the rise of Middle Helladic culture in Greece. To the substratum Schachermeyr would attribute certain characteristics—a skill in modelling, a love of colour and geometric pattern—which survive in historical Greek art. More significantly, perhaps, he attributes to it a pre-Greek religion centring on a mother-goddess, some aspects of whom can be traced in later Greek goddesses (e.g. Athena); and the pre-Greek elements of Greek language.

The diffusion of pre-Greek types of place-name in relation to the Early Bronze Age civilizations of the Aegean and Anatolia was first noted long ago; Schachermeyr's survey goes wider, and postulates (on the basis of place-name evidence in conjunction with the affinities of material culture already demonstrated) a single 'Aegean' ethnic and linguistic area from Malatia in eastern Anatolia to Carnuntum on the Danube and Sicily in the west. The concept of such a linguistic substrate is of course not new so far as Greece is concerned; but since it was first propounded by Kretschmer the tendency has been for philologists to subdivide it; Schachermeyr boldly views it as all one. He is perhaps even bolder in suggesting that this 'Aegean' language is derived from some *Vorstufe* (probably agglutinative) from which not only the I.E. that subsequently overlaid 'Aegean' but also the Semitic group of languages was descended. To confirm or refute this is perhaps beyond the possibilities of philology. For Greece, at least, the 'Aegean' substrate seems to be a reality, and matches well the archaeological evidence. We ought to have a survival of it, unaffected by the I.E. invasion of Middle Helladic, in the Minoan language still enshrouded in the obscurity of Linear A script. The decipherment of that, and future excavations both in the Aegean and Anatolia and elsewhere, will test Schachermeyr's hypotheses. For the present let us congratulate him on so courageous an interpretation of so unusually wide a range of material.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

F. H. STUBBINGS

TYRANNY AND ITS CAUSES

A. ANDREWES: *The Greek Tyrants*. Pp. 167. London: Hutchinson, 1956. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.

TYRANTS appeared in Greek cities in various circumstances and at various times from the seventh century onwards, but the most significant for the development of Hellenism are those of Old Greece in the Archaic period. It is with them that this admirable book is mainly concerned. Andrewes begins by surveying the constitutional development of early Hellenic communities, the evidence about the tyrants, and the meaning of the word *τύραννος*. He proceeds to consider Phidon of Argos, Cypselus and Periander of Corinth, the Orthagorids of Sicyon, the Spartan constitution, Solon and contemporary Athens, Mytilene in the time of Alcaeus, and Pisistratus. Interlaced are accounts of military, economic, and racial factors. Next come the peripheral tyrants who were connected with foreign aggression—Polycrates of Samos, the Persian nominees at Miletus, Hippocrates and the Dinomenids, and afterwards Dionysius in Sicily. A last chapter mentions the late recurrence of tyranny in Greece itself.

Andrewes rightly confines himself to the better-known tyrannies and recog-

nizes variety in the circumstances in which they arose. This is important, whatever may be thought of his particular choice of circumstances—at Argos military, at Corinth commercial, at Sicyon racial, at Athens the enlightened ambition of Pisistratus. As a general cause he chooses the invention of the hoplite, which he ingeniously but speculatively attributes to Argos and connects with Phidon: the new military importance of the middle class that provided the hoplites encouraged its political aspirations, and the tyrant was its champion. But though Aristotle may give this theory some indirect support, we never hear of the hoplite militia itself establishing a tyrant nor yet taking sides in the overthrowing of a tyranny. It seems to me more likely that the *δημος* (in any sense of the word) was nowhere politically organized and active before the end of the sixth century, and perhaps even the Athenian democracy was the result as much of accident as of inevitable evolution. Thucydides, whom Andrewes neatly quotes for a definition of tyranny, connects the rise of tyrants with the growth of prosperity, and in fact their location coincides more closely with commercial importance than with hoplite armies. Even so, there is less evidence of the political activity of a plebeian merchant class than of quarrels within the aristocracy. That is the impression given by the fragments of Alcaeus and by the manoeuvres through which Pisistratus established himself, and (as Aristotle observes in *Pol.* 1302^a) oligarchy is peculiarly liable to internal dissension. Andrewes's treatment of Sparta also seems to imply too much. He regards the Lycurgan constitution as an alternative to tyranny, though by dating it soon after the first appearance of tyrants he implies that Sparta must have been one of the most advanced or susceptible states of the seventh century. Perhaps more emphasis should be put on the privileged position of all Spartiates, which united them against the larger masses of their subjects.

Some minor questions may well be asked. How can painted pottery be used as a guide to a city's prosperity (pp. 18, 83, 111)? Why should the introduction of coinage dislocate society (p. 78)? To what extent did political friendship normally affect trade in the Archaic, or even the Classical, period (p. 50)? Did Periander overstrain Corinth, and did Corinth after him steadily decline in power (p. 52)? Was Al Mina a settlement of Ionians, at least from Ionia (p. 79)? Is there evidence of more than one vase-painter—and him a generation before Solon's reforms—emigrating from Corinth to Athens (p. 86)? Further, the reconstruction of Ionian trade (p. 118) is rather conventional, and the poverty and depopulation of Greece in the early centuries of the Iron age may be exaggerated (p. 78). The bibliography could usefully add S. Mazzarino's *Fra Oriente e Occidente*.

But differences of opinion are bound to occur in a subject so obscure as early Greek history. What is striking about *The Greek Tyrants* is its clarity and sane judgement. The style is admirably simple and concise. The evidence is given fairly, with economical references in the few notes. The argument is lucid and honest and remarkably free of prejudices recently current in the Oxford school. The arrangement of the material is in some chapters rather forced, but makes reading easier. The conclusions are properly incomplete, since the evidence does not allow certainty. Altogether this is an excellent and a necessary book, which gives the best account not only of the tyrants, but of early Greek history generally, and it is as valuable to the expert as it is to the beginner.

MIXED CONSTITUTIONS

KURT VON FRITZ: *The Theory of the Mixed Constitution in Antiquity*. A critical analysis of Polybius' political ideas. Pp. xiv+490. New York: Columbia University Press, 1954. Cloth, \$7.50.

THIS is an important work for all students of Roman history; of much wider interest than the title would seem to indicate. The author is concerned with the constitutional theories of Polybius proposed by the latter in his desire to explain the greatness and success of Rome in the period from the great reverse of Cannae to the demonstration of her Mediterranean dominance at Pydna. The historian, when he reaches the point of Cannae, sets out (vi. 3 ff.) his doctrine of the rise, decline, and succession of simple constitutions, and notes their instability arising from the predominance of one element. The alternative is the 'mixed' constitution (combining elements of monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy); two forms are to be distinguished: the mixed constitutions established by the act of a legislator (the classical example given by Polybius was Sparta), and those, like Rome, in which the constitution is naturally developed to form this mixture of simple elements (vi. 11. 11), in such a way that for a time at any rate the cyclic process characteristic of simple constitutions is avoided.

There arise from Polybius' digression a number of problems of maximum interest, which are well and thoroughly treated by von Fritz: the political experience of Polybius himself as a Greek; the nature and identity of the earlier theorists who influenced him; the latest date of composition of his work and the modifications it underwent in the process. A certain amount of discussion is accorded to certain Greek constitutions, especially Sparta; it is only too apparent how deficient and uncertain our knowledge is in this sphere. This is preliminary to the main part of the book, which deals with (i) the necessary distinction to be made between the concepts of a mixed constitution and a system of checks and balances; (ii) the reality of Polybius' identification of the monarchic, aristocratic, and democratic elements in the mixed constitution with the consuls, Senate, and Assemblies at Rome; (iii) the means whereby, in times of crisis (vi. 10. 14: 'in the course of many struggles and troubles') Rome broke away from the 'natural law' of the cycle of constitutions, and was saved by the mixture of elements from suffering the fate of simple constitutions. (iv) A long and valuable discussion by von Fritz of Roman constitutional and political development examines the relations of magistrates, Senate, and People, and seeks to establish the degree to which legal competence did or did not coincide with actual power. This examination is carried on to the end of the Republic to discover the causes of its decline.

It is hard to judge von Fritz's ultimate assessment of Polybius' views; his final conclusions seem vague. He shows clearly that the relations of consuls, Senate, and Assemblies are not to be explained on the simple basis of three distinct elements checking each other in a mixed constitution, and demonstrates the interpenetration of the elements through the fact of the consuls' close connexion with the senatorial order, and the existence of patrician-plebeian family relationships and the *clientela* as links between the 'People' (*demos*) and the aristocracy. He also shows Polybius' failure to make clear how the monarchical element (the consuls) operated to restrain the Senate. He asserts that Polybius

took too rigid a view of the supposed system of checks (p. 345: 'P. . . described the Roman state as a perfect mixture of monarchy oligarchy and democracy, in which none of the three elements can move without the concurrence of the two others . . .'), and failed to see the modification of constitutional relationships which took place, and the shifts of power. It is not clear that Polybius overlooked this, and he seems to infer movement in vi. 18. 7-8: 'whenever one of the elements of the state grows to excess and is moved by party spirit, and prevails more than it should, it is evident that, for the reasons given above, no one of the three is self-sufficient, but the intention of each can be checked and hindered by the others, and so no one of the parts grows excessively or despises the others. For each adheres to its appointed position.' The stress seems to be on excess of change, not on an absence of movement, though it must be admitted that the meaning of ἐμμένει τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις is obscure. Von Fritz rightly stresses the moderation characteristic of the earlier period of Roman history. Until the second half of the second century Rome avoided excessive violence; concessions were made, and the recipients of them did not push their demands too far, and their allegiance to the state was preserved, with an acceptance of its basic order (as P. must mean by ἐμμένει τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις). The reasons for this moderation might have been further explored by von Fritz, with the meaning of Polybius' term ἐπίγνωσις (which von Fritz rather unsatisfactorily translates (p. 365) 'insight') as used in vi. 10. 13-14: 'the Romans, through many struggles and difficulties, choosing the better course through their repeated profiting from experience in reverses . . .'. As in the case of other terms used by Polybius it is not easy to decide its meaning.

In discussing the decline of the Republic, which Polybius clearly foresaw (iii. 4. 5. 7-8, vi. 9. 9 and 12, vi. 57; in vi. 9. 12 Polybius surely says that the Roman constitution *will* change, not 'may', as it is rendered p. 364) with its ultimate end (vi. 9. 9: 'master and monarch'), though not its intermediate stages, von Fritz has many valuable and interesting things to say.

The whole book is a stimulating one and deserves close study. The excerpts in Appendix I need to be studied with the Greek text. There are a few misprints: Archaeans (p. 15), Lerma (p. 16), Sculla (p. 273).

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

ROMAN SEA-POWER

J. H. THIEL: *A History of Roman Sea-Power before the Second Punic War*. Pp. viii+368. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1954. Cloth, fl. 25.

H. T. WALLINGA: *The Boarding-bridge of the Romans*. Pp. viii+96; 2 plates, 12 figs. The Hague: Nijhoff (London: Batsford), 1956. Stiff paper, fl. 8.90.

PROFESSOR J. H. THIEL's well-known earlier *Studies on the History of Roman Sea-Power in Republican Times* (1946) covered in fact the years 218-167 B.C. This present volume is concerned with sea-power down to 218, while it is hoped to complete the study with a third volume dealing with the years 167-31 B.C. The same sturdy independence, bringing with it as it were a gust of fresh sea air, marks the present, as the earlier, contribution. Thiel refers to

the fact that critics of his earlier book directed their objections too much to its form, especially its English, outspokenness, and repetitions. To the first two items few should take serious exception: how much better for most historians to have a work in readable English than in impeccable Dutch (and in any case the style of this present volume is greatly improved). But with regard to the repetitions, since Thiel says that he 'is apt to call a spade a spade', it must be said plainly that one reader at any rate considers that the book would have been better for drastic pruning. Thiel asks the reader to realize that 'I am a born schoolmaster who wants to rub in what he believes to be important'. Well and good, but since he is not writing for schoolboys, he could well have made the book shorter, more workmanlike, and presumably therefore cheaper. Nevertheless it makes pleasant reading.

That said, the book may be given a hearty welcome. It is written with deep interest in and appreciation of moral values, though the author's feelings often lead him to vehement or exaggerated statements, e.g. that the Romans 'were born hypocrites' (p. 23). It is not surprising therefore to find that he attributes war-guilt for the First Punic War to Rome. 'The truth is that in 264 the Carthaginians behaved like somewhat weak gentlemen, the Romans on the contrary like rogues, and hypocritical rogues into the bargain: is it the historian's duty to speak the truth or to obscure it?' (p. 129). Now this may well be true, but its truth depends on the acceptance of the genuineness and current validity of the so-called Philinus treaty. If we could be certain about the existence of the treaty (which Polybius denied) and its terms, then such indignation would be justified. Thiel himself has earlier (pp. 12 ff.) argued for its genuineness, but he would scarcely claim, one would imagine, that he has established this beyond all shadow of doubt. In relation therefore to 'the historian's duty', would it not have been better when dealing with the events of 264 to have tempered the indignation, since it is only probably and not certainly justified? This example has been mentioned to show that the author's enthusiasms may sometimes lead him somewhat far: when he says that the means used by the Romans in 264 'were thoroughly damnable' (p. 133) and apologizes for the strength of the language, he appears to apologize for the wrong thing. Such a phrase might be applied to Roman conduct towards Carthage in 238 or 150-149, but can we be absolutely certain that it is justified in 264?

The first chapter deals with the development of Roman sea-power before 264. Thiel emphasizes that the beginnings were very modest and makes the interesting suggestion that the creation of the duoviral squadrons in 311 may be due to Appius Claudius, designed, with the Via Appia, to protect communications with Campania by sea and land. For these squadrons Rome supplied the ships, the allies the crews. Roman dislike of the sea was confirmed by the result of the only two actions by these squadrons that are recorded (in 311 and 282). After 282 the ships were allowed to rot and Rome turned for naval aid to Carthage and then to her Italian allies: the maritime cities now had to supply ships *e formula* (an obligation which applied, Thiel believes with H. Horn, to all maritime allies, not merely to the Greek cities). With this reorganization was connected the institution of the *quaestores classici* in 267, and its purpose was coastal defence. Rome did not wish to challenge the quinqueremes of Carthage with weaker allied triremes and pentekonteres: when the challenge by sea came in 260 she reverted to the Roman as opposed to the

allied system and paid for the new ships (now quinqueremes), though they were largely manned and even built by allies. This distinction between two systems, Roman and allied, seems a little sharp. The last chapter gives a sketch of the inter-war years (242–218), where the value of a fleet 'in being' is emphasized; the political influence of the peasants in these years, despite Flaminius' achievements, is perhaps somewhat over-emphasized.

The bulk of the book gives a full and critical account, year by year, of the naval side of the First Punic War. Here it must have been difficult to decide how much of the strictly non-naval aspect to include: Thiel has tended to be generous. Problems are discussed as they arise with common sense and clarity. On the vexed question of the strength of the fleets, Thiel follows Tarn though with some modifications; he also agrees with him on the question of the quinquereme. In his appraisal of naval strategy he sees the Romans' only major error in their policy in 253 (they should have started the systematic blockade of Lilybaeum instead of the African raid which was followed by loss by storm), while the one fatal Carthaginian blunder was to let slip the opportunity of offensive action in Sicily in 248. He also gives some lively appreciations of the abilities and failings of the admirals of each side. It is not possible to discuss any of his detailed views here, but he has provided a careful study to which all students of the period and readers of Polybius will constantly turn with profit and enjoyment.

To one specific problem, that of the *corvus*, which Thiel handled in his first volume, he now returns (pp. 101–28). He demolishes the theory of E. de Saint-Denis (*Latomus*, 1945), of which the mechanics were surely not soundly based, develops his own theory, examines more thoroughly the tactical side of the problem, and refers to the work of his pupil Dr. H. T. Wallinga. This last has now been published and forms a study of wider interest than the title might suggest, because Wallinga realizes that the technical problem of the construction of the *corvus* must be firmly related to the background of what the Romans could expect their newly built fleet to accomplish. He thus examines some aspects of the tactical development of Greek naval warfare, particularly ramming, the *διέκπλους*, and boarding. On the mechanical side his theory is not unlike that of Thiel, but he is able to eliminate the hinge which Thiel postulated and which would have weakened the contraption in action. On paper his solution appears attractive and neat, though possibly a little complicated to work in the heat of battle. No doubt also his scale-model works well, but Wallinga himself warns us (p. 13) that there are dangers inherent in theorizing from such reduced models. There is also the human as opposed to the purely mechanical aspect: one would like to know what really happened to all the men on board when two ships met at full speed from opposite directions and a *corvus* was dropped. With ordinary ramming (when according to Wallinga the *ἐπὶ τῆς* would start to move along the enemy's *παρεξέπειρα* at more than six metres a second: p. 24 and corrigenda), marines crouched down (Diod. xx. 51. 2.) or an admiral might be hurled overboard (Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 33): how soon were the Roman legionaries in good shape to advance two abreast over the newly dropped bridge? Wallinga's interesting theory raises many speculations in the reader's mind, but they cannot be pursued here, e.g. could not some of the rear members of the file of 60 legionaries posted along each gangway have been trained to handle the ropes that raised and lowered the *corvus* and thus have left more room on an over-

crowded foredeck and have rendered more practical a simpler system of pulleys (cf. p. 64)? Wallinga also discusses the reason for the abolition of the *corvus* which he places after Drepana rather than with Thiel before that action. Finally, since Wallinga complains (p. 15) that in a footnote I have referred to the mutually exclusive theories of Tarn (who reduced the *corvus* to little more than an improved grapnel) and of Thiel without committing myself to either, I should add that the authority of Polybius combined with that of the Professor of Naval Architecture at Delft (who assures us that 'it is most improbable that the stability of a quinquereme of about 250 m.³ would be seriously upset by an extra deckload of about one ton', which is what Wallinga estimates the weight of the *corvus* to have been: I hope that the Professor has reckoned with the fact that part of that weight was raised above the deck level and swung round, even presumably when the sea was not as still as a millpond)—such authority compels me to sail under the Dutch flag in the stormy waters of this controversy. And if we part company with Tarn and accept the view that something like what Polybius described really worked, then Wallinga's ingenious reconstruction has much to commend it.

King's College, London

H. H. SCULLARD

ROMAN OFFICERS

JAAKKO SUOLAHTI: *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period*. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Ser. B, Tom. 97.) Pp. 444; 2 maps. Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1955. Paper, 1,500 mk.

THIS study of officers who served in the Roman army of the Republican period attempts, with some repetition, to analyse statistically all the known careers and to draw some conclusions of social importance from them. Suolahti limits himself to military tribunes, *II viri navales*, and prefects, and takes them in turn: after a general introduction and a short treatment of the historical origin of each class, the method of election to it and its functions, he then considers the social and local origins of its members. His conclusions are conveniently summarized in large type at the end of each section. There follow two appendixes, of which one discusses in just over three pages the sources for the period, the other, running into more than 100, presents in tabular form the names of all the officers whom Suolahti has found, including thirty-six not in *R.E.* This collection contains one curious confusion: Rutilius, Caesar's land-commissioner of 45 B.C., is admitted to the list of prefects; men like L. Vibius Paciaecus are just as startlingly omitted. This looks like a hasty reading of *M.R.R.* taking the place of first-hand acquaintance with the sources. At the end of the book there are an extensive bibliography, indexes, and maps which show the places of origin and domiciles of the officers.

There is little new in what Suolahti has to say in his introduction and in his remarks on the background to the offices, apart from a few oddities such as his choice of A.D. 14 as a limit to his researches on the ground that 'at that date the people were deprived of their right to elect magistrates', and the appearance of *conquisitores* (sic: p. 46—and in the Index!). Nor do his general conclusions surprise: the contribution of the nobility to the tribunate and the prefectures declined, most noticeably in the last century of the Republic, their places

being taken by men belonging to lower Senatorial *gentes* and by equestrians from the rural aristocracies; officers tended to come more and more from new sources of recruitment which widened as the Republic declined.

It is the way in which Suolahti moves towards these conclusions that provokes questions. His contribution, which, despite the appearance of *M.R.R.*, is a considerable one and obviously the product of long and heavy labours, depends for its value on the answers it makes to them. Has he, for example, appreciated fully the treacherous character of his sources, particularly in the early period, and has he been fair with his readers on this? Here perhaps the difference in length between his two appendixes is not unimportant: whatever the strength or weakness of his method in handling the material, the conclusions he draws cannot free themselves from the nature of the evidence, and it is this which he does not seem fully to have grasped or to have exposed. After all, it is not without first-class significance for a student of social structure that the evidence for most of Suolahti's statistics is for his purposes of the worst possible kind, i.e. dependent on socially biased, class-conscious sources of one sort or another. Cicero, *Brutus* 62 and Livy viii. 40. 4 need no emphasis here, but Suolahti might have reminded us of their lessons. He appreciates that the material which he has to handle is thin (he estimates that in the period 509 B.C.-A.D. 14 we know of no more than 1 per cent. of all the military tribunes who served) and that therefore the documented careers are unlikely to be a representative cross-section of the officer-class. But he does not insist enough, as he cannot without at the same time prejudicing his results, on the unreliability (for a social historian) of the evidence. Something might have been gained if he had lowered his sights and omitted the period before 218 B.C., thereby losing no more than thirty-nine military tribunes (out of a total of nearly 350), two *II viri navales*, and three prefects.

An equally important question, perhaps: has Suolahti been strict enough with his material? His method is to analyse each officer-class in terms of the political and social status which the various *gentes* represented in it achieved. That is to say, it is nomenclature which is primarily important and which produces the statistics: relationships may be vague or even unattested but conclusions about an officer's social status are drawn by relating his name to that of other holders of it. So Suolahti can go on to tabulate his statistics of *gentes* under the headings patrician/plebeian, consular/lower senatorial/equestrian. In a short review of this kind it is not possible to say much more than that the discipline exercised by Suolahti in his logging of the evidence is not consistently sharp nor his discretion always refined. His collection of officers is to some extent weakened when he handles it without that firm grasp which a closer acquaintance with the methods of Münzer and Syme might have given him.

Nor is it possible to feel completely certain that he has understood some of the more important features of the background: he does not seem to appreciate the degree of control exercised by the *nobiles* in the field of recruitment at a time when military service was an indispensable preliminary to the elected tribunate, for, given the social framework of the early Republic, it is surely important to bring out the fact that service as a *contubernalis* would be a major entrance to the offices and that this would depend on the favour of the commander who would in all likelihood be a *nobilis*. How much wider socially in fact was the class of *tribuni militum a populo* than the *rufuli*? Suolahti does not help as much as he might here, for it is an unfortunate omission on his part that he has no separate

lists for these two types of tribunes. His cataloguing of early officers, together with his connexion of them with other members of the same *gens*, are to that extent not as revealing as they might be: it ought not to go unrecorded in any study of the military tribunate that Marius had previously served, probably as a *contubernalis*, with Scipio at Numantia.

Despite these misgivings, English readers in particular can be grateful to Suolahti for his industry. There are not many books to be read in English on the Roman army at any stage in its history, and the Republican period in particular is ill served. He deserves our thanks for offering his contribution in our language. Naturally enough misprints are not absent (even the list of *corrigenda* is not immaculate: in this for page 231 fn. 1 read page 231 fn. 5): among the more serious ones not subsequently corrected p. 157 n. 7 should have Plin. *N.H.* 7, 136; p. 91 n. 2 reads 165 instead of 145; and p. 217 n. 2 offers XXVII instead of CXXVII. The bibliography has a strange omission: should any work which provides as this one does (pp. 21 f.) some notes on the early army organization omit the name of Fraccaro?

Magdalen College, Oxford

P. J. CUFF

ROMAN MANPOWER

A. E. R. BOAK: *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West*. Pp. viii + 169. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Cloth, 36s. net.

In the field of ancient demography, with its lack of firm statistics, and the differing interpretations by scholars of those we have, the situation is similar to that existing in the study of ancient economic history. In neither case, however, ought scholars to be deterred from making some effort to determine at least the main points. Professor Boak believes that the limited evidence from the Roman Empire concerning population trends can best be interpreted in the light of modern demographic knowledge about 'backward' countries. His interpretation is that the population of the Empire began to decline in the middle of the second century; and this decline created a manpower shortage, i.e. there was difficulty in finding enough people to carry on the state's essential military and administrative services and in producing an economic surplus to pay for these services. This shortage was exacerbated by the troubles of the third century with the result that the 'recovery' of the early fourth century was not maintained.

The most important point made by Boak seems to be that in materially primitive societies, with a low expectation of life, the population takes a very long time to recover from natural disasters. So in medieval England the population took two centuries to recover from the Black Death. Hence the plague which affected the Roman Empire during the reign of Marcus had a much more serious effect than is generally supposed; in fact it was still being felt when the wars and further plague of the third century came; and conditions in western Europe were for centuries unpropitious for a change in the population trend.

Boak considers it impossible to give even an approximate figure of the population of the Empire at a given date (but prefers the lower estimates which

have been made). The evidence which he uses is derived chiefly from well-known features of the later Empire—the settlement of barbarians within the Empire and the difficulties of recruiting, the attempt to make most occupations hereditary, the increasing weight of taxation, and the decline of the cities. From each of these he draws arguments to support his thesis of a serious and increasing manpower shortage. Not that he claims to have discovered what Professor Momigliano called ‘the D.Phil. candidate’s dream of sleeping beauty—the true cause of the Fall of the Roman Empire’, but to have drawn attention to a neglected factor which contributed to that revolution. This claim seems to the reviewer to be justified; there are few occasions in which loose statements like ‘the agricultural population had almost disappeared’ (in Gaul by 284) mar the argument.

But some will put less weight on this new factor than Boak does. Declining population can hardly be the whole cause of the imposition of hereditary status. The state’s requirements had risen greatly, especially under Diocletian; and the hereditary colonate was a logical result of his reform of the taxation system, designed to provide the increased revenue from existing resources. Further, once one occupation, particularly the preponderant one, was made hereditary, others must soon be affected. The state literally could not afford any movement of labour. The mass of laws on the subject are either closing loopholes or indicate the inability of the administration to prevent a certain amount of movement between town and country and between the social orders.

Again, is it true that shortage of manpower provides the explanation of the use of Germans in the army? Admittedly there was growing reluctance to take men from the land. But barbarian mercenaries and localized recruiting from backward areas is known in the second century. From *c.* 250 the Illyrian element in the army was out of proportion to the relative population of that area. The use of Germans seems to be the end of a process whereby the strength of the army came in succession from Italians, urbanized provincials, and semi-Romanized peasants. We have to ask why the barbarization of the army set in before ‘shortage of manpower’ became pressing; why so populous an area as Africa produced so few soldiers. It could be argued that reluctance to serve in the army tended to follow material prosperity and security; that emperors became unwilling to use compulsion widely; and that some, from a view of their personal security, actively encouraged the recruitment of semi-barbarous and barbarian troops who might be less likely to indulge in emperor-making.

Lastly, Boak might have considered the point made by N. H. Baynes, that any set of causes supposed to account for the fall of the Western Empire must be shown not to have operated in the Eastern Empire. He suggests that it was simply poverty that made the West unable to maintain its essential military and administrative system. In antiquity, as Boak says, poverty implies a shortage of labour. That the East as a whole was more populous than the West seems certain. But how much? Plagues and wars afflicted the East as well as the West and the symptoms of manpower shortage adduced by Boak are as evident. An assessment of the differences between East and West in availability of manpower for the state’s service and for the production of a surplus for its support would be a useful addition to this valuable book.

LIVIA'S GARDEN ROOM

MABEL M. GABRIEL: *Livia's Garden Room at Prima Porta*. Pp. vii+55; 7 figs., 36 plates. New York: University Press, 1955. Cloth, \$12.00.

THIS beautiful underground room has been fortunate in its publishers. Under nineteenth-century conditions it could not have been engraved more meticulously than in *Antike Denkmäler*. Under those of today no black-and-white photographs could have shown it more clearly or elegantly than those in this book.

The room, in the Empress Livia's villa, north of Rome, was some 40 feet long and, with its plastered tunnel vault, almost a double cube. It was perhaps an indoor 'garden', for use in bad weather. It is dated to the first years of Augustus, close to the 'Farnesina'. Van Deman used to date the 'Farnesina' (now, alas! destroyed) to the dictatorship of Iulius. But its building technique, with its use of tufa quoins, seems to have been that of Prima Porta also. Both, then, should perhaps be dated about 30 B.C., however little we may trust Miss Blake's comparison of the filling ornaments in both with those of the Ara Pacis.

The painted walls on all four sides of our room exhibit a continuous grove of trees and flowering shrubs, against a mistier background, also of continuous trees. The view is bordered above by a fringe hanging in the foreground, as if from the roof of a pergola; while the grove is separated from the spectator by two fences. The more massive rear fence runs back in small *exedrae* at regular intervals, leaving space in each for a single large tree, before which there is a gap in the front fence. So the eye naturally divides the paintings into six panels, each balanced about a tree. Fringe, grove, pivotal trees, and fences fill the 'Pompeian' roles of upper entablature, landscape, near colonnade, masking walls, and podia. It could have been shown more clearly that this is a 'Pompeian' architecture of leaves and flowers, animated by small variations, such as creepers and birds. So the artist aimed at that 'Variety in Unity' desired by Villet-le-Duc, which is, indeed, most easily achieved in Classical Art. But he refused to impair his broad design with insects. And, like our great classical poets, he supplemented the deficiencies of nature by extending the flowering-time of his blossoms. For all these reasons his trees cast no shadows.

The whole is unique. The nearest parallels, which are cited on p. 8, all have figures or garden ornaments. Yet one wishes that some had been illustrated, especially the continuous 'garden' in the Stabian Baths. It also seems to have had very natural plants; and one cannot easily find a picture of it larger than Mau's sketch (*Pompeii*, fig. 82).

There is a good section on technique. The background is apparently in true fresco, while the detailed foreground was applied in tempera. The birds, different in technique, were painted last of all. The vibrant lighting, a source of great charm, is thoroughly inconsistent. Gabriel identifies a master, who painted her 'Panel II', and several assistants.

The treatment of the birds and flowers is thorough and learned, but rather disorderly. Note 22, on p. 11, is ambiguous. The roses at Prima Porta 'are the only naturalistic representation of roses remaining from antiquity'. The author must mean rose bushes. Actual roses are found in Pompeian swags and on the coins of Rhodes. Ancient roses are less certainly known than Gabriel would

maintain. Did the Damask Rose bloom twice yearly, as she alleges, or only once, as W. L. Carter seems to think (*Antiquity*, 1940, p. 254)? Is the 'cabbage rose' the *rosa centifolia* of the ancients, as the author supposes, or an eighteenth-century creation, as urged by G. S. Thomas (*The Old Shrub Roses*, pp. 63 ff.)?

So this beautiful and learned book might have gained from a neater exposition and a wider study of parallels. It is carefully produced, and I have noted only one misprint, 'biferique rosaria Paesto' in note 22, on p. 11.

It has one serious blemish. It omits the history of the paintings after their discovery in 1863, merely mentioning an Italian pamphlet that describes their removal to the National Museum in 1951/2. Was this just the modern Italian rage for locking things up? The *Manchester Guardian* for 25 January 1954 alleged that 'exposure to the atmosphere and incautious use of wax varnish in restoring the paintings' (when, and by whom?) had 'caused progressive deterioration'. Also that the iron hooks fastening the tiles beneath the plaster were rusting. But in 1909 Baedeker called the paintings 'admirably preserved'. When and why did they decay, and was removal to Rome the only remedy? The author, with her great technical knowledge, should have discussed these topics. A comparison of her Plates 6 and 7, a recent photograph and an old Anderson photograph, will show how much the paintings have recently lost. The bird's nest in the oak-tree has vanished. On p. 29 she says that it is now destroyed. Her evidence suggests that it could quite well have perished in the recent removal.

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

HUGH PLOMMER

ST. PETER AND THE VATICAN

JOCELYN TOYNBEE and J. WARD PERKINS: *The Shrine of St. Peter*. Pp. 292; 32 plates. London: Longmans, 1956. Cloth, 42s. net.

THIS absorbing book has been so widely noticed in the daily and weekly press, especially the Roman Catholic periodicals, that it needs neither introduction nor description; but no review I have yet seen has mentioned the excellence of the book production and the remarkable freedom from errors¹—features which in a sense characterize the inner qualities of the work itself, with the lucidity of its narrative, the comprehensiveness of its documentation, its cautious correctness, and its observance of detail.

Since the excavations beneath St. Peter's have been shrouded throughout in so much mystery, Professors Toynbee and Ward Perkins have had to rely for much of their detail on the official *Report*, which it is their aim to interpret for a wider public. The pattern of their book in general follows that of the *Report*, vol. i, which begins with a description of the Vatican area in antiquity and leads up to a full account of the Shrine and of its history as far as Pope Callixtus II. This general scheme is improved and elaborated in many respects; the authors are not concerned to present the archaeological technicalities in full—for these, those interested must consult the *Report*; but they do study the

¹ As *corrigenda* I note: p. 39 centre, for 'the south side of the forecourt' read 'the north side . . .'; p. 98 n. 23 ad fin., read 'h(eredom) n(on) s(equetur)'; p. 232 n. 30,

for 'Eustochius' read 'Eustochium'. On plate 4 the first tomb shown is not D but C. There are minor errors on pp. 250 and 261.

cemetery as a whole with the utmost care, giving particular attention to Tombs B, F, and Z, whereas the *Report* dealt only with the tombs immediately adjacent to Campo P, the site of the Shrine itself; and the history of the Shrine, and especially of the columns of the canopy and (later) screen, is carried down to Michelangelo and beyond.

This section on the cemetery is very fine indeed, and provides a notable study of the sepulchral art, architecture, and symbolism of the first three centuries of our era which, although of necessity compressed, will long remain a fundamental contribution to the subject. It ought also to be noted that, amidst the scholarly interpretation and wealth of documentation—much of it extremely recondite and accessible only with difficulty—the authors preserve a striking sense of excitement and atmosphere throughout. Those who have been privileged to visit the excavations will recapture, as did the present reviewer, the impressiveness of that sudden transition to pre-Constantinian Rome which mysteriously grips one on descending the stairway and stepping into the street of tombs. This vitality pervades the whole book, and matches the liveliness of some of the sculpture and painting illustrated in the generous set of plates—where lack of that colour so well reproduced in the *Report* and on the Vatican postcards is the only cause for regret.

If the 'pagan' section, so to speak, may be regarded as the most convincing part of the work for the professional, it is the question whether St. Peter was actually interred here, and whether the bones discovered beneath the 'red wall' are his bones, which has provoked the chief interest of the layman. In this book this takes a less central role, in proper relation to the discussion of the cemetery as a whole and of the subsequent history of the site as it developed once the belief that the apostle had been buried here was seriously acted upon by the Christians. What matters in the whole problem is simply that, when the pagan builders of the red wall in the Antonine period came across a burial, and made their wall-vault over it so as to avoid *violatio sepulcri*, the Christians thought the burial was that of St. Peter—or, it might be suggested, for some reason deemed it politic or desirable to think so.

It must be noted that this reaction was immediate; the *aedicula* was built while the red wall was still under construction. The niche N¹ was built into this wall as it went up ('sul vivo del muro rosso'—*Report*, i. 126), and the wall itself was so weakened by the new constructions and alterations that it had soon to be buttressed. This is positive evidence, and the considerations of policy or belief which it attests have conditioned the history of the site ever since. More than that cannot be said—whatever the report on the bones found by the excavators beneath the wall: the publication of these has been extraordinarily dilatory, but they cannot affect the present issue. Meanwhile there remains one major speculation, of the 'Cleopatra's nose' variety: suppose, for the sake of argument, that the builders of the red wall had built it obliquely across Campo P, and in so doing had disinterred the poor grave θ , the earliest datable burial on the site: would the Christians have accepted *that* as the authentic tomb, and would the subsequent history of *τρόπαιον* and basilica have been reorientated around it?

Further, there are points on which any conclusion is either impossible or

¹ The discussion of the San Sebastiano site is a valuable inclusion, though lack of illustration makes it difficult to follow. On

the Via Appia *Memoriae* see now H. Chadwick, *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. vii (1956).

must await new research. Excavations beneath San Paolo-fuori-le-Mura, which stands in much the same relation to the Via Ostiensis cemetery as does St. Peter's to the cemetery of the Via Cornelia (?), are now a necessary complement to the work already done. A major difficulty concerns the absence of *graffiti* mentioning St. Peter around the *memoria*, especially as compared with their number at San Sebastiano. This is a significant matter on which the authors touch only in a gingerly way. It requires further consideration, as indeed does the whole problem of the 'rival' shrine on the Via Appia, for which Duchesne's theory represents no more than an unsatisfactory compromise.

The note of caution characteristic of the book is a notable and properly *wissenschaftlich* contrast with the host of popularizing surmise which these excavations have produced.¹ It is perhaps to be feared that, whatever scholars may say, the ordinary Roman Catholic layman may feel that he *ought* to believe that the Saint's relics were actually found. It is an advantage that one of the authors is herself a Roman Catholic, prepared to be more hesitant over the excavations than the excavators themselves. However, this book, which will reach—indeed, deservedly has reached—a wider public than the merely academic, needs to be reinforced by a pronouncement, with the authority of His Holiness himself, which will make the situation clear to the most humble of those for whom St. Peter's is the centre of Christendom.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

GEOFFREY WOODHEAD

HISTORIOGRAPHY

A. MOMIGLIANO: *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*. Pp. 414. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1955. Paper.

THIS work, whose scope is not perhaps quite accurately described by its title, consists of reprints of articles contributed by Professor Momigliano to a variety of periodicals, and of addresses given by him on a variety of occasions. The wisdom of such reprints has at times been doubted, but this collection has something different about it, though I am not sure that some of the more detailed studies should have been included: e.g. 'La Leggenda del Cristianesimo di Seneca', 'Un Capitolo Ignoto dei "Discorsi" del Machiavelli', 'Notes on Petrarch, John of Salisbury and the "Institutio" Traiani'. The same is probably true of some of the short reviews, and certainly of the account of British Prehistoric Studies, 'Ricerche Preistoriche in Inghilterra' (from *Rivista Storica Italiana* of 1949), which was useful, no doubt, if the great work of British prehistorians had been hitherto ignored in Italy, but hardly worth reprinting here. One's surprise that the task of such a review fell to a scholar mainly a historian of Greece and Rome is offset by admiration of the skill here displayed in mastering unfamiliar material. A rather different criticism might be directed against the reprinting of the article 'Gli Studi Italiani di Storia Greca e Romana dal 1895 al 1939', written in 1945 at a period difficult for access to material. It was justifiable in the highest degree, as revealing one aspect of Italian scholarship, in a volume presented to Benedetto Croce (and is aptly dedicated to the

¹ Taking their cue from the over-categorical statements of the *Report*: 'Basti accennare al felice ritrovamento della tomba

di S. Pietro, identificandone il luogo là dove la tradizione la collocava', etc.

memory of Mario Segré), but a good part of its relevance, as it treats a subject in which studies are international, disappears when it is taken from its first context. The same national delimitation is imposed in the article 'Studien über Griechische Geschichte in Italien von 1913-1933', which in part overlaps the article in Italian. It is not exactly clear to the reviewer what hard-pressed scholars will have the time to read these when they have other and wider bibliographical aids at their disposal.

The kernel, however, of this publication is a series of studies which well merit reprinting in this form. In them Momigliano either treats the development of the study of Ancient History on a wider plane of personalities and ideas, or demonstrates the way in which its study has been closely associated with important cultural and political developments. Though dealing with a narrow field, his article 'The First Political Commentary on Tacitus' shows the influence on a given period of a classical author seen as possessing relevance to contemporary thought. 'Whether we like it or not, it ("Tacitismo") percolated through the political and historical thought of a whole century, both because of its Machiavellian and its anti-Machiavellian elements. It roused the opposition of Jesuits and (later) of Free-thinkers. It helped the discussion on Machiavelli when Machiavelli was too dangerous to be dealt with directly. It combined anti-tyrannical sentiments with realistic remarks on modern and ancient tyrants, and finally prepared the way to what has been called the "red" Tacitus of the French Revolution.' The wide view demonstrated in this passage, supported by a great and easily deployed erudition, is typical of the principal studies in this book. Again, the influence of antiquarianism on the study of Ancient History is admirably delineated in the long article 'Ancient History and the Antiquarian', at the highest level a stimulating study of one aspect of the development of historical ideas, at the lowest an ample quarry of theses. Several historiographical studies treat lines of approach and trends of thought: 'La Formazione della Moderna Storiografia sull' Impero Romano', 'Genesi Storica e Funzione Attuale del Concetto di Ellenismo', 'Friedrich Creuzer and Greek Historiography', 'Per il Centenario dell' "Alessandro Magno" di J. G. Droysen'. Perhaps even more important are those which demonstrate the influence of great exponents of the history of the Ancient World on the development and progress of the discipline, with a skilful and erudite assessment of their achievements. Of particular interest to this country is his discussion entitled 'Gibbon's Contribution to Historical Method', in which he describes Gibbon's great work as 'a unique self-portrait of the eighteenth-century mind', and makes clear the significance of Gibbon in his times and the influence of the man and his work on historiography. He does the same for Grote in his lecture 'Grote and the Study of Greek History', with an admirable review of Grote's predecessors and his place in the study of Greek history. As a tail-piece to the work and influence of Grote, Momigliano discusses the prospects for Greek historical studies, and that decline of 'creative' work on Greek history which he detects after 1900, asserting that 'practical politicians and moralists' are no longer interested in Greece, and that the 'position is frankly critical'. It is not uninteresting to observe that of the two men just mentioned Gibbon seems to have got little from the classical discipline of school and university; Grote, 'a vulgar materialist' as Ruskin called him, was 'not a member of either of the old Universities', as Shilleto, the composer of polished versions in Greek and Latin, 'thankfully' observed. If there is a

crisis in Greek history it is surely due in the first place to the complexity of its subdivisions as a *professional* study, which would daunt even a Grote or a Gibbon (though not, it must be observed, a Rostovtzeff), and to what may be described as an excess of inadequate information, leading to so much effort on the testing of details that little time is left to seek illumination from the wider field of history. In this country too the close attachment of Ancient History to classical studies and an educational system based on them is not without its harmful effects. It may well be true that the scholar is forced to devote his most serious attention to a restricted period, but there are wider fields of which he must take some account and without which he is unlikely to perceive what is really relevant in his chief study. It is as a demonstration of what can be done in this connexion that this volume is so valuable.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

THE HUMANISTIC MOVEMENT

PAUL OSKAR KRISTELLER: *The Classics and Renaissance Thought*. (Martin Classical Lectures, vol. xv.) Pp. x+106. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1955. Cloth, 20s. net.

THE four lectures printed here were given at Oberlin College in February 1954. Professor Kristeller tells us that his aim was 'to draw a rough but comprehensive map of Renaissance learning in some of its aspects'; and the aspects he chose to discuss were the study of Aristotle, the study of Plato, and the Humanist contribution to patristic scholarship. Some readers, misled by the generality of the title, may deplore the absence of such germane and important topics as the revival of Stoicism. But gaps are inevitable in any short survey; and what Kristeller had the opportunity to say remains eminently worth reading.

The first lecture is introductory—a description of the Humanist movement, in which the author's wide learning shows to great advantage. A beginner who took the trouble to master these few pages would find himself forewarned of most of the common errors of Renaissance scholarship, including the error of identifying the term 'Renaissance' with some particular pattern of culture, which has led to so much fruitless controversy. One point here, which will be of special interest to classical scholars, is Kristeller's insistence on the Protean character of their discipline: that 'the use made of the classical heritage has been subject to many changes', and each period has offered 'a different selection and interpretation of ancient literature'. The study of the past has never been out of touch with the present.

Having sketched in the background, Kristeller then gives us his own account of the Humanist movement. He describes it as 'a cultural and educational program which emphasised and developed an important but limited area of studies. This area had for its center a group of subjects that was concerned essentially neither with the classics, nor with philosophy, but might be roughly described as literature. . . . The *studia humanitatis* includes one philosophical discipline, that is, morals, but it excludes by definition such fields as logic, natural philosophy and metaphysics, as well as mathematics, astronomy, medicine, law and theology.' 'By definition'—but Kristeller does not say whose

definition he has in mind. The Humanists themselves were certainly unaware of any restrictions on the range of their interests. We are told later that the definition I have cited applies primarily to the period before 1450, after which 'the influence of Humanist learning spread outside the limits of the *studia humanitatis*'; but even before 1450 these limits which Kristeller wants to impose are hard to reconcile with the facts. Did not the earlier, as well as the later, Humanists take the world for their intellectual province? We know from the recent work of Hans Baron that political thought benefited from their scholarship before the end of the fourteenth century. We know that Aurispa's efforts to procure the writings of Archimedes aroused notable excitement; and there was Pletho. He fascinated the Florentines as an exponent of Plato. Can we say that a man like Niccoli felt all but moral philosophy to be outside the range of his interests?

The second lecture brings us directly to the philosophers and begins with a salutary reminder. If it is true that the Renaissance was a revolt against the Middle Ages, it is also true that, in the universities, the position of Aristotle remained unshaken as the great authority. So far from diminishing, the volume of effort devoted to the study of his work actually increased. It was during the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in the heyday of Humanism, that Italy, which in earlier times had neglected philosophy for law, developed a flourishing school of Aristotelian studies. While admitting that we know too little about these philosophers to generalize about influences on their thought, Kristeller seems to incline to the view that their debt to Humanism was small. He dismisses the early Humanist polemic against the schoolmen as ineffective and emphasizes rather the importance of the translations which the Humanists made of commentators like Alexander of Aphrodisias whom Pomponazzi preferred to Averroes. Regarding the Humanists as men of letters has led him to restrict their influence to the literary field. Another scholar, who took a wider view and like Garin defined Humanism as an outlook, might well have traced some connexion between the problems Pomponazzi chose to discuss, which had moral implications, and the Humanist insistence that philosophy ought to have a meaning for life.

The account of Platonism is disappointing. Plato was studied for the most part by amateurs and often by amateurs whose main interest lay outside of philosophy; and so his ideas served as a background to a bewildering variety of speculations and attitudes: scientific, ethical, political, and religious. Kristeller has some fascinating paragraphs about Platonism and science; but his remarks about the cult of Platonic Love add little to Miss Robb's well-known analysis, while political theory and mysticism are hardly mentioned. The fourth lecture, on the other hand, is both novel and informative. The Humanists devoted much effort to the study of patristic sources; and Kristeller provides a useful corrective to our habitual neglect of this aspect of their work. One regrets only that he has not chosen to tell us more about the careers and personalities of such industrious translators as the Italian Persona and the Frenchmen Perion and Frédéric Morel.

Kristeller stands in the front rank of Renaissance scholars. His views can be criticized on occasion, but they cannot be disregarded. If the reader is surprised when he says that 'Petrarch shuns the medieval theologians except St. Bernard', since Petrarch is known to have possessed works by Hugh and Richard of St. Victor and Fulbert of Chartres, this surprise is merely a tribute to the

otherwise impeccable correctness of his information. And it may interest him to know that there is evidence to back his assumption that St. Basil's letter on the pagan poets was read in schools. The title appears in the curriculum of the Elizabethan grammar school at Hexham in Northumberland.

King's College, Cambridge

R. R. BOLGAR

SHORT REVIEWS

DIETER KAUFMANN BÜHLER: *Begriff und Funktion der Dike in den Tragödien des Aischylos*. Pp. 116. Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid, 1955. Paper.

This admirable study sets out from a clearly drawn distinction between divine and human justice. The writer finds it characteristic of Aeschylus to associate with the notion of Dike offences against the gods which are more commonly regarded in terms of piety (*εὐσεβής, δεινόν*). The ministers of divine justice are the Erinyes, and the offences punished are particularly, though not exclusively, concerned with parents, *ξένοι*, and suppliants. Claims of right upon the human level are of subordinate importance. Thus in the *Suppliants* the legal status of the Danaids is strictly subordinate to their suppliancy which raises an issue of divine justice; and in the *Septem* the offence of Polynices in attacking his native land outweighs whatever claims he may have in human justice. The examination of these two plays is careful and judicious, and the point made seems to be valid, though it should be noted that (as the writer stresses) the offence of the Egyptians is primarily the attempt to impose marriage by force, i.e. an offence beyond what is normally associated with the divine law. It may well be that in neither trilogy was the issue of human justice ever decided, but in their fragmentary state we cannot be sure of this. It is perhaps a pity that the writer does not allow himself to speculate on the missing plays. In the *Suppliants*, for instance, it would appear that, as in the *Oresteia*, references to justice look forward, among other things, to an actual trial; and something might have been said about this, as also about the reversed role of the Danaids in the second play.

Most attention is, naturally, given to the *Oresteia*. Here, too,¹ the writer finds Dike

upon two planes and human justice subordinated to the divine. An example is in the kommos of the *Agamemnon*, where the Chorus are virtually compelled to concede the claims of Clytemnestra upon the human plane, while convinced that her offence against divine justice will be punished. The distinction is perhaps sometimes pressed to the point of over-simplification. There is admittedly a difference between the revenge of Clytemnestra, which involves an offence against the marriage-tie, and that of Aegisthus. But could it be said that the death of Aegisthus does not exemplify the divine law *παθεὶν τὸν ἐργαστέρα*?² If there is a difference between the crimes of Clytemnestra and Orestes, it is hardly correct to say that Orestes does not act upon the principles of human justice. Aeschylus is at some pains to show that, on one plane, this is precisely what Orestes is doing, and the passage which is quoted from *Cho.* 497 ff. merely shows the carrying-over into the chthonian world of the revenge-principle of human justice. The writer protests against a simple identification of divine justice with *talio*. But the principle of retaliation, if it does not exhaust the Aeschylean conception of divine justice, is perhaps a more essential aspect of it than the writer allows. He rightly emphasizes the importance of the Erinyes in the first two plays of the trilogy. The fact that at this stage the ministers of divine justice are, as it were, embodied in vindictive human agents may well have constituted for Aeschylus the most grievous problem of theodicy.

But this, and other problems, cannot adequately be dealt with in a brief review. The writer argues his case well and, in discussing

the same as in the plays which he examines, it is not developed in terms of Dike, and he makes the interesting suggestion that this theme has been avoided as inappropriate to the Persian political context.

² Cf. *Cho.* 577 f.

¹ On the *Persae* the writer notes that, although the conception of Zeus is essentially

a multitude of debated issues, shows a mature judgement in choosing between rival hypotheses. In a field about which much has been written he has made a contribution which deserves the attention of all serious students of Aeschylus.

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM

King's College, London

ÉMILE JANSSENS: *Agamemnon. Texte d'Eschyle commenté.* Pp. 169. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1955. Paper.

THIS edition has the same admirable purpose as Janssens's *O.T.* (C.R. v [1955], 102): to enable a reader who has learnt little, or forgotten much, Greek to enjoy some at least of the experience of reading the play in the original. On account of the greater linguistic difficulty of the *Agamemnon* the reader is helped by a sort of appendix in which the less common words are explained and the meaning required by the context indicated. Since some help is given for nearly every line, one may suspect that the editor would have been better advised to give a literal prose translation, which would have occupied about the same space. But he is content to refer the reader to Mazon's version, though he himself uses Wilamowitz's text, except that he prefers to attribute 1327-30 *ὡς βορέαυα πρᾶγμα* . . . to the Chorus; in fact *charité brutale* suggests that he also accepts, and rightly, the *χαῖρος βλαῖος* preferred by Mazon at 182.

The 'aesthetic' commentary printed at the foot of the page is, as Janssens's earlier book would lead one to expect, both eloquent and sensitive. Of this play every reader has his own interpretation, and I note a few observations which are particularly likely to provoke disagreement. It is very doubtful whether Clytaemnestra enters so long after her husband as 855; that she should begin by addressing not him but the Chorus is less surprising if she has heard his previous speech. In spite of Murray it is hardly credible that Cassandra alights only at 1178 having delivered her dochmiacs from the *ἀντίκρ.* And it is going rather far to identify the Chorus with the people of Argos.

Excessive ingenuity in the detection of ambiguities and suggestions is generally avoided; indeed a little more might have been said about continuity of imagery. But I do not believe it is relevant to the bereaved *αἰγυμνὸς* that Helen was produced from an egg, or that Agamemnon treads the purple

because Clytaemnestra has managed, without actually saying it, to convey the impression that she has committed him to do so by a vow for his safe return.

Places where a little more explanation might be welcome are the account of the disappearance of Menelaus, which is apt to seem a mere digression until the importance of his absence is pointed out, and Cassandra's departure, where the great dramatic force of *ὡς ξένοι* 1316 depends on the legal usage of *μαρτυρεῖν*.

D. W. LUCAS

King's College, Cambridge

Pindari *Carmina cum Fragmentis*, edidit BRUNO SNELL. Editio altera. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. viii+375. Leipzig: Teubner, 1955. Cloth, DM. 14.80.

THE changes in this revision are small corrections, for help with which Snell thanks half a dozen named scholars. They are difficult to detect, but nine or ten have caught my eye, apart from those anticipated in the original *corrigenda*, and it seems worth while to list these for the benefit of owners of the first edition.

In the tables headed 'Codices Pindarici' and 'Conspectus Codicum' Snell has tacitly dropped [B], previously defined as 'lost readings of B, recovered from the *ed. Rom.* of 1515 and from Par. Gr. 2709'. This slight change affects only the apparatus of P. 1. In the critical note on O. 10. 9 Hermann's *ὁνάρων* is now mentioned, and the full stop at the end of P. 3. 92 is now a comma. In the fragments, Housman's *κυριᾶν* has ousted Boeckh's *μοιριᾶν* in *Pae.* 6. 118. Sitzler has gained a mention on *Pae.* 7 b. 15, and fr. 191 now carries two asterisks. In the Index of Proper Names the virtuous Lynceus has at last established his separate identity.

Except for a few verbal changes in headlines and the like, in the interests of clarity, that seems to be almost all that is new. I have noticed only one fresh error, the dropping of I. 8. 54-70 from the list of B's losses on p. vi.

D. S. ROBERTSON

Trinity College, Cambridge

LILLY B. GHALI-KAHIL: *Les enlèvements et le retour d'Hélène dans les textes et les documents figurés.* (École Française d'Athènes, Travaux et Mémoires,

fasc. x.) Pp. 364; 105 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1955. Paper (plates in cardboard folder), 7,000 fr.

STUDIES of particular subjects of ancient art are once more becoming popular, especially for doctoral dissertations. On the whole they prove unsatisfactory, since they require industry and knowledge rather than original thought, and although Mrs. Ghali-Kahil has examined Helen's adventures with thoroughness and unusually good judgement the results are disappointing. She deserved a better field of study.

The plan of the book is this. First comes the literary treatment of Helen in Homer, the Epic Cycle, Hesiod, and the Lyric poets; divine responsibility is partly replaced by the potency of beauty and some moral criticism. As a counterpart there follow catalogues and discussions of artistic representations till c. 425 B.C. Of these the most remarkable is Menelaus dropping his sword at the sight of his errant wife's bosom, popular around the middle of the fifth century. As might be expected, there is a progression from the simple Archaic scenes of action to the more reflective groupings congenial to classical taste. Chapter 3 considers the handling of Helen by the dramatists and the sophists and orators; the moral issues are now important as well as beauty. Chapter 4 turns to the artists of the late fifth and the fourth centuries: Paris has replaced Menelaus as the favourite partner and the setting is usually the boudoir. Next we have the Hellenistic editing of the legend and the attitude, strikingly unsympathetic to Helen, of later literature, Latin and Greek. The artists, however, continue in the classical tradition; it is worth noting the difference between the art and the literature of the Roman Empire. The last four chapters discuss Etruscan art, 'apologies' for Helen, Theseus and Helen, and—very briefly—the origins of Helen. Finally there come a conclusion and good indexes. The illustrations are ample and as good as circumstances allow, though scales might have been given.

In research of this kind it is tempting to force conclusions, but generally and in all important arguments Mrs. Ghali-Kahil is honest and judicious. In interpreting subjects she is usually persuasive or at least makes a good case: Theseus is the weakest of her identifications. Her discussion of the various types is illuminating, especially when they are losing their particular significance. Her opinions on the origin of those types are less convincing: if literary versions inspired vase-painters it is hard to explain the variations

in south Italy, and if free painting provided models the details were not followed at all closely. But in Archaic and Early Classical times legends must still have been living in the form of folk-tales. It seems to me (in spite of Mrs. Ghali-Kahil) that one of the valuable conclusions from her work is that in general Greek art and literature developed independently, since the choice of subject was determined as much by technical ability as by any spirit of the time. On the models of Pompeian wall-paintings she is wisely reticent, but perhaps she neglects the aesthetic needs of composition. Still, this is a competent piece of work, which shows a grasp of the literary as well as the artistic monuments.

Other criticisms are minor. P. 47 n. 2: this is not the earliest painted inscription known, nor is the interpretation necessary. P. 71: the remark about serpents is naïve. P. 76: on Clazomenian sarcophagi of this class the duplication of figures for symmetry is regular. P. 98 n. 1: I do not see the relevance of this note. P. 162 no. 123: it is unlikely that here *H* should have the value *h*. P. 197: the interpretation of the siren is rash. P. 197: was beauty considered the *ἀρετή* of woman in Classical Greece? P. 237 no. 186: this piece is of the second century A.D. P. 264: it is true enough that the problems of Etruscan iconography are commonly evaded, but can Malafisch be identified with Helen? P. 281: the verdict on the Etruscans and their women is facile. P. 292: are Herodotus' introductory chapters to be taken so seriously? Pp. 321, 328-9: it is brave to hope that the legend of Theseus' rape is older than Paris', especially if originally Theseus was an Ionian hero and Helen a Laconian goddess.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,
Cambridge*

JONAS PALM: *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien*. Pp. 212. Lund: Gleerup, 1955. Paper, Kr. 33.

THE first object of this study was to determine the linguistic and stylistic relationship of Diodorus to his sources. Many verbal correspondences were known to exist between the few remnants of these and Diodorus' text, and these have led many to conclude that the latter is altogether as derivative in its expression as it is in its matter (so Grenfell and Hunt, *Pap. Ox.* 1610, p. 111). Palm's minute examination of these correspondences in their contexts does not support this view.

He points out that (1) Diodorus can be shown to give a close, continuous paraphrase of his source only in certain circumstances (e.g. in the Agatharchides extract in iii. 1-51: in a borrowed geographical description there was good reason for not departing too far from the form of the original); (2) even when Diodorus' words are closest to those of the source, there are usually notable divergences. These are not haphazard, but are meant to bring the style of the particular passage into harmony with that of the rest of the Bibliotheca. In fact, a more or less constant style prevails throughout the work, and this can only be the native product of Diodorus himself.

No one claims that this flat and listless style has any great literary merit, though it expresses Diodorus' somewhat superficial thoughts with a remarkable clarity. Dr. Stephen Usher, in an essay which I have found it helpful to consult—*Development of Post-Attic Narrative Prose Style*, London Ph.D. thesis, 1955—pertinently points out that Diodorus' dexterity is well illustrated by a passage for which he can have had no model, the episode of the Egyptian cats, i. 83. The importance of vindicating it for Diodorus is that it can then be recognized as a contemporary Hellenistic phenomenon, and the many characteristics which it has in common with other Hellenistic prose-writing can be understood within their proper context. Of those analysed by Palm the following may be mentioned: a strong nominal and analytic tendency in grammar, a tendency to periphrasis, to euphemism, to 'officialese', a tendency to construct and adorn the work with the more obvious of the figures familiarized by Isocrates, a more or less common vocabulary (with many classicisms, such as *χρη*, clinging on by the skin of their teeth!), and, in the historians, a curious attitude towards the reader which at once keeps him at a distance and seeks to involve him sympathetically in the action. These features are already foreshadowed in Ephorus (some even appear in Aristotle's *Ath. Pol.*), and they are variously represented in Polybius as well as Diodorus, fragments of official papyri and historical documents of the third century, scientific writers such as Philo of Byzantium and Apollonius of Perga, and the literary Greek of the Apocrypha and N.T.

The constant recurrence and preponderance of these features in Hellenistic literary prose seem to justify Palm in regarding that prose as an entity in its own right, distinct from its classical predecessors on the one hand and its Atticistic successors on the other. It is a mistake, he thinks, to see in this

Hellenistic 'Normalprosa' a reflection of the spoken Koine (correct, then, Wilkgren, *Hell. Gr. Texts*, p. 162). Certain traits, such as its handling of the optative and its neglect of the vivid present, preclude this explanation. It shares with Atticism the desire to preserve what it can of the style of the classical authors, but it has no hesitation in 'modernizing' them in accordance with current notions of what constituted dignified utterance or writing. These notions are not derived from everyday speech, but from the documentary usages of the numerous classes of officials, professional people, scientists, which sprang up in Hellenistic times. It is a *Papiersprache*, remarkably akin to our own modern official and technical jargons and journales.

In this book Palm uses a wealth of statistics to establish some of the main facts about Hellenistic Greek and to correct many misapprehensions. Yet he does not allow statistics to paralysise his intuitive perception of literature. He sees, for instance, and thinks it worth remarking, that the same figure of speech which an Isocrates or a Diodorus uses merely for clarity can be fraught with emotional significance in Demosthenes, with spiritual in St. Paul (p. 115). The result is that the book is stimulating throughout, and a mine of suggestive information about classical, as well as later, Greek. Misprints or inaccuracies are negligible, except for some curiously erroneous lexicographical data on p. 46 (*χόνδρος*, for instance, is not 'only found earlier in Hippokr. Aristot. Theophrast.'). The book has scanty indexes, and is beautifully printed.

J. H. KELLS

University College, London

EUGÉNIE DE KEYSER: *La signification de l'art dans les Ennéades de Plotin*. (Univ. de Louvain: Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 4 ser., fasc. 7.) Pp. 124. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1955. Paper, 80 B.fr.

A PENETRATING study of Plotinus' theory of beauty would be welcome. The present work is concerned with aesthetic questions, but its scope is limited to a discussion of passages in which Plotinus refers—incidentally for the most part—to art and artists. The plastic arts, drama, and music are considered in turn, and there are chapters also on the artist, the spectator or listener, and on the character of the work of art.

The author finds generally a development

in Plotinus' thought from a conception of the arts as producing mere imitations of material objects to a theory of their direct representation of intelligible forms. The turning-point, so far as the plastic arts are concerned, is, we are told, the allusion to Phidias creating his Zeus *πρὸς οὐδὲν αἰσθητόν*—an allusion which occurs in a treatise (v. 8) of the middle period and is held to disagree with a passage in an early work (v. 9) denying that the 'imitative arts' can find a place in the intelligible world because they use 'a sensible model'. Is this in fact a change of front and not rather a change of emphasis? Bear in mind that the Phidias reference occurs in similar terms in Cicero and Philostratus and presumably belongs to the tradition of the Academy; also that Plotinus at i. 6. 9 introduces into a simile a description of a sculptor at work, which is clearly meant to imply something more than the slavish imitation of a sensible model. The author herself suggests the right conclusion in her final summing-up: Plotinus 'situe l'œuvre humaine au sommet du sensible, mais il l'y insère profondément, refusant de confondre l'objet perçu par le sens avec sa divine origine'.

The development theory is even less convincing when applied to drama and music. The same passage in v. 9 does duty for the 'earlier' view: dancing and miming are among the imitative arts which are rooted in the sensible world, and we are asked to understand from Plotinus' admittedly obscure statement (the text is uncertain) that he accords a similar place to music. The revised opinion is represented for drama by a metaphor and nothing else—there is no advance in abstraction—and for music by a discussion of perceptible and imperceptible harmonies in i. 6, a treatise usually considered to be earlier than v. 9 but here regarded for no sufficient reason as coming *peu de temps après* (the reference to Bréhier on p. 22 as supporting this chronological transposition would seem to be wrong literally and substantially).

The magical and symbolic aspects of art raise questions with which Plotinus is deeply concerned, and a lengthy and useful discussion is marred only by a tendency to *fantaisiste* interpretation. The mention of temples leads to a disquisition on Egyptian divinities, none of whom is so much as mentioned by Plotinus. Egyptian hieroglyphics are more to the point, but here the text (v. 8. 6) and its difficulties are left far behind. An investigation of the word *ἁγίασμα* would have benefited by a comparison with Platonic usage, and a similar analysis of the meanings of *εἶδος* would have been especially helpful,

because this difficult word lies at the base of so much of the inquiry. As it is, the translation *forme transcendante* is given even where the Aristotelian sense is clearly called for.

The work as a whole shows evidence of careful thought, and if the results are disappointing, the fault lies partly in the choice of subject. Art is not a central interest in the *Enneads*, and the temptation to eke out the scanty material is naturally strong. Hypothesis as such is desirable and necessary in dealing with a writer so little explored as Plotinus, but it must be controlled by a sympathetic understanding of his habits of thought and above all by a patient exegesis of his text. In this respect the author has relied too much on Bréhier's translation, though in one place at least she asserts her independence to good effect: it is surprising, however, that she never once mentions the work of Harder or Cilento. The reference on p. 22 to v. 3 should read v. 8, and that on p. 99 to i. 6. 5 should presumably be to i. 6. 7.

B. S. PAGE

University of Leeds

JEAN DUMORTIER: *Saint Jean Chrysostome: Les cohabitations suspectes: Comment observer la virginité*. Pp. 137. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1955. Paper.

JOHN, the golden-tongued preacher of Antioch chosen by the court for the unenviable task of being bishop of Constantinople on the death in 397 of the clever administrator and ex-civil servant Nectarius, was at all times a zealot for spiritual discipline and the suppression of moral laxity. But ascetic zeal is a difficult basis for curbing an even greater ascetic zeal. In the contemporary Greek church he was confronted by a curious practice against which episcopal synods had long been uttering threats, apparently with little effect. This was the custom under which men vowed to chastity lived in community with women committed to similar vows, who were abusively entitled by critics *subintroductas*. The practice went back to the apostolic age. The only real question at issue among the commentators on 1 Cor. vii. 36-38 is whether St. Paul was already confronted by it and tolerated its continuance, or whether he was giving somewhat opportunist advice to engaged couples influenced by rabidly ascetic teachers, such as would have had the accidental effect of creating it. In this volume M. Dumortier of Lille edits the text of the full-scale attack upon this custom composed

by John probably in his youth as a deacon (so Socrates against Palladius who places the work early in his episcopate). The document is of considerable interest not merely to theologians but as a source of social history. It reads like a brash, juvenile, and epideictic piece, composed in an elaborate style with constant classical allusions, particularly to Demosthenes and Plato, which suggests that the adherents of the custom were drawn from the educated and wealthy classes of Antiochene society. It is a pity that John's critique reveals next to nothing of the attitudes and self-justification (if any) of his opponents. His own arguments must be frankly admitted to be pretty queer. His two chief complaints are that while irregularities do not actually occur (a significant admission), the relationship is not and in the nature of things cannot be quite as Platonic as it is claimed to be; and in any event it causes scandal to the faithful. These two grounds, in no way unreasonable, are supplemented by some very odd supporting arguments, e.g. that God specially provided woman with the weapon of attracting the opposite sex since otherwise no man would ever be persuaded against all rational judgement to live with so weak and stupid a being, or that when a visitor calls upon a male member of such a community of ascetics it is embarrassing to find the place littered with feminine knick-knacks and laundry.

The edition is competently constructed on the basis of twenty-two manuscripts ranging from the ninth to the seventeenth centuries and is well annotated. M. Dumortier rarely finds cause to intervene with emendations, and even his effort at 3. 8 (p. 52) is a work of supererogation.

H. CHADWICK

Queens' College, Cambridge

JEAN DANÉLOU: Grégoire de Nysse: *La Vie de Moïse ou Traité de la Perfection en matière de Vertu*. Pp. xxxv+156. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1955. Paper.

The collection *Sources Chrétiennes* advances well. The publication of H. I. Marrou's masterly edition of the *Epistle to Diognetus* declared decisively that the series would now be expected to go far beyond the *haute vulgarisation* of its early beginnings. The book under review is a revised and enlarged version of the first volume to appear in 1942 when it offered only a French translation of

the second part of Nyssen's *Life of Moses*; even then Fr. Daniélou's comments made this unpretentious book more than it seemed. Now at last he has produced this full-scale, annotated edition of the complete text, based on collations of ten of the principal manuscripts and taking into account the fifth-century papyrus from Fayum. The manuscripts divide the work into two parts, *historia* and *theoria*, the former being quite brief and consisting of a simple moral application of the biblical story. The editor has added section numbers, and also marginal references to the standard edition of Migne, now rendered hopelessly antiquated. The editing is careful and cautiously conservative towards the tradition. Emendations are infrequent and almost always carry conviction. At 357 B, p. 62, *épelperai* is brilliant; admittedly at 361 B, p. 66, one is left wondering. Might it not have been better if the editor had more clearly marked in the text by brackets where he actually inserted supplements of his own instead of noting the fact only in the apparatus under the form 'om mss'? But perhaps this is a fussy complaint. More disturbing is the number of printing errors in the Greek text, where breathings have suffered rather badly. While none is likely to cause any hesitation to readers of this *Review*, the fact is unfortunate in a book likely to be used by beginners in the study of patristic texts who may be puzzled by such a form as *ἐπαρο-νέδευσεν* (p. 15). However, we have at last a really good edition of a remarkable work of major interest both for theology and for the history of hellenism. The introduction, a masterpiece of brevity, not only deals tersely with Gregory's relation to Plotinus and with the manuscript tradition, but also places the work in the historical situation and brings out its interest for the principles of exegesis; the work admirably illustrates the fusion of Philonic allegorism with the specifically Christian treatment of the Exodus as a 'type' of the redemption of Christ. Above all, Fr. Daniélou emphasizes the *leitmotiv* of the work, that perfection is never the static possession of salvation but consists in a never-ceasing advance. Both in the introduction and in the commentary this theme is excellently treated. Admittedly I venture to think that there is a slight exaggeration of the extent to which this can be called *une idée vraiment neuve* and *une création originale* over against the precisely similar teaching of Nyssen's master Origen (e.g. *de Princ.* iv. 3. 14; *de Orat.* 25. 2; *Num. Hom.* 17. 4), but it is true enough that Nyssen, schooled by the Neoplatonists, formulates the doctrine much more carefully.

The indexes include a list of Greek words.

But why not an index of subjects? That the reader must make for himself.

H. CHADWICK

Queens' College, Cambridge

ATTILIO DE LORENZI: *Cronologia ed Evoluzione plautina*. Pp. 223. Naples: Istituto della Stampa, 1952. Paper, L. 2,000.

This is the report of another one-man expedition into the jungle of Plautine chronology, with the ultimate objective, in this case, of discerning the 'lineaments of Plautus' personality'. Because they have not felt the compelling need to discover the *anima di Plauto*, Leo, Fraenkel, and Jachmann are summarily relegated to a footnote on p. 5, to receive only very occasional mention thereafter. These outposts of critical sanity left behind, de Lorenzi is free, after some comment on his predecessors' works,¹ to indulge his bent for unprovable hypothesis and tendentious argument. By way of sample and for their amusement-value I record three 'particular results' of this inquiry to which the author gives the prominence of special mention in his italicized foreword. These are:

1. Plautus' birth is determined as *circa* 15 September 259 B.C., and late in life he married a wealthy widow of Sarsina. Plautus, we are invited to believe, acted the bachelor Periplectomenus in the first version of the *Miles (Iudi Romani)*, 205 B.C., and in l. 629 gives his age as 54: his alleged marriage rests on no more than Simo's words in *Most.* 690 f. and the joke in 770 taken with the foregoing.

2. The exposure of anti-Terentian polemic by the writer of the *Casina*-prologue: for this the inquisitive may read pp. 204-5.

3. The title *Trinummus* refers to a currency-change in 194 B.C. This is elicited from Livy's statement (xxxiv. 52. 6)² about the weight of the tetrachma; how anyone could miss the conversational force of *tribus nummis* in l. 844

of the play passes my comprehension, but de Lorenzi is evidently unaware that the phrase recurs in *Most.* 357, in a context that disposes of the matter beyond cavil.

There is much else that is questionable, although not all the reasoning is (or, indeed, could be) quite so nugatory as these specimens show. Some sections are in themselves not devoid of usefulness. However, Plautus is made into an active political mouthpiece, beyond the conceptions of Buck and Tenny Frank, so that in de Lorenzi's pages he often 'breaks a lance', whether for his friend Naevius (p. 48), or for the *Campanus genus* of *Trin.* 545, or other deserving cause. His 'experimental period' (*Epid.*, *Asin.*, *Patruus Pultiphagonides*) was followed by an 'optimistic' phase when he wrote (between 201 and 199) *Amph.*, *Capit.*, *Stich.*, *Poen.* as a 'gigantic victory tetralogy' (p. 98). A middle period came next, first of 'exoticism' (*Merc.* 198; *Persa* 196), then of 'sentimentality with a tendency to the supernatural' (*Curc.*, *Trin.*, *Cist.*, *Most.*, all 195-193). This was succeeded by one of 'civil and artistic maturity' (*Truc.*, *Rud.*, *Pseud.*, *Aul.*, and *M. Glor.* in its present state: 192-190); *Bacch.*, *Men.* (in revised form, see p. 194), and *Casina* are products of his 'senility'.

In treating the allusion-passages, mostly familiar from earlier researchers, de Lorenzi shows more discretion than might have been expected, but the evidence is pressed to its limits and he has an Italian's obsession about *plausus theatri*. For stilometric criterion (for which no more than approximation is claimed) he puts forward what he calls a 'rectification' of Sedgwick's canticum-count. For de Lorenzi, however, it is not an increased mastery of canticum-technique (and therefore a larger number of lyric elements) that argues lateness, but the frequency of continuous iambic senarian passages which increase from one in the (early) *Epidicus* to five or six in the (late) *Bacchides*. Where several plays show the same number of such passages, relative posteriority is indicated by the larger total of senarians composing them: thus *Persa* with three totalling 376³ is late

¹ K. H. E. Schutter's conclusions are incorporated, but his essay is not criticized. As de Lorenzi's work bears the same date (1952) this is understandable; there must have been a delay in issuing, however, as the review copy was not received until early in 1955, whence the lateness of this notice.

² Wrong reference given on p. 139 by de Lorenzi. The book is liberally spangled with evidence of slap-dash proof-reading (see next note).

³ Unfortunately the table giving this on p. 22 contains numerous arithmetical errors. The totals for *Pseud.*, *Rud.*, and *Bacch.* are 101, 98, and 101 lines out respectively and are presumably misprints (the odd lines must be due to difference of text used). But the figure for *Asin.* is 185 on p. 22, 175 on p. 58: the true count is (Lindsay's text) 192. *Persa* obstinately refuses to yield more than 336 senarians (de Lorenzi says 376) or *Menaechmi* more than 337 (352, de Lorenzi). Although these differences do not upset the

than *Mercator* whose three such sections only yield 317. In favour of this pseudo-mathematical curio (is it anything more?) it is claimed that it would put Plautus more directly in a line of development from Livius Andronicus (as inferred from Livy vii. 2, a passage on which de Lorenzi leans heavily) to Terence. But Plautus is surely too individual a figure to fit any preconceived line of development; and while the resulting sequence of plays may not be (except for *Poenulus* where special pleading is necessary, pp. 78 f.) demonstrably impossible, I do not see that much significance can be made of it.

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

Jesus College, Oxford

VINCENZO USSANI: *Insomnia. Saggio di critica semantica*. (Studi e Saggi, 3.) Pp. 205. Rome: Signorelli, 1955. Paper, L. 1,600.

THIS is a closely argued and well-documented study of the meaning of *insomnia* (neuter plural) with special reference to three passages, Sallust, *Epist.* ii. 12. 6 and Virgil, *Aen.* iv. 9 and vi. 896. Ancient and modern authorities and *loci similes* from Greek and Latin writers are cited in the fullest detail, illustrating both the specific exegesis of these passages and their background of Pythagorean and Stoic ideas about the world of dreams. Briefly the conclusion is that in all three passages the word *insomnia* means dreams, not sleeplessness.

The first chapter is concerned with a study of chapters 12 and 13 of Sallust's second epistle. USSANI analyses the poetic diction and rhythm of the passage, shows how certain ideas and phrases which are common to Sallust and Virgil may be traced back to Ennius, and discusses the philosophical ideas (with special reference to Pythagoreanism) reflected in Sallust's exhortations to Caesar. The second chapter shows quite convincingly, on both linguistic and philosophical grounds, that in this passage from Sallust the phrase *insomniis exercitus* must mean 'tormented by dreams'. Thus a Sallustian precedent is established for the two passages in Virgil (in which either the meaning of 'dreams' has been denied or the usage regarded as an innovation by Virgil), and the possibility is set up that

postulated sequence of plays, their existence undermines confidence in the author's dependability.

Sallust's use of the word derives from early poetry.

USSANI next examines in detail *Aen.* iv. 9 *Anna soror, quae me suspensam insomnia terrent*. He defends the traditional view that *insomnia* = *ἐνύπνια*, and argues powerfully against R. J. Getty's view (*A.J.P.* liv [1933], 1-28) that the meaning is *ἀγρυπία*, or waking visions. The parallels between *Ap. Rh.* iii. 636 f. and *Aen.* iv. 9 f. on the one hand, and *Ap. Rh.* iii. 751 f. and *Aen.* iv. 529 f. (cf. Val. Fl. vii. 3 f.) on the other, appear to me to be outstanding among the many strong arguments for the traditional rendering. The difficulty felt by many commentators about the apparent contradiction between line 9 and line 5 *ne placidam membris dat cura quietem* is surely not a real one: when Virgil says that Dido's passion does not allow her peaceful repose, he is simply contrasting her present turmoil of mind with the normal restfulness of sleep, and the line is not more specific than that. It can mean that she slept brokenly and fitfully just as easily as it could mean (were it not for line 9) that she did not sleep at all.

The final chapter is concerned with the two gates of Sleep in *Aen.* vi. 893 f., the one for *verae umbrae*, the other for *falsa insomnia*. As in the passage of Sallust the word *insomnia* here occurs in a context influenced by Pythagorean ideas, and USSANI discusses how these ideas have modified Virgil's use of the original image in Homer, *Od.* xix. 559 f. He convincingly upholds the view that *falsa insomnia* are not waking visions, nor *falsae umbrae*, but equivalent to *somnia vana* (line 283). The distinction is between real apparitions—like (say) that of Tiberinus in Book viii—which come in sleep (*umbrae, imagines*), and unreal, imaginary dreams. The former may be associated with *somnus levis*, and the latter with *sopor, ἀδύπνος ὕπνος*.

There are three appendices dealing in greater detail with certain passages referred to in the body of the work, and large indexes of *loci citati* and of modern authors mentioned (among whom we miss H. R. Steiner, *Der Traum in der Aeneis*, 1952). There are a few misprints, especially in the Greek and Latin quotations; and R. J. Getty is incorrectly called *lo studioso americano*.

The book gives a careful and valuable account of a much disputed and important word: it is always full of interest, and it makes a very real contribution both to our knowledge of ancient ideas about dreams, and to our understanding of the passages discussed.

R. D. WILLIAMS

University of Reading

VINCENZO USSANI: *Studio su Valerio Flacco*. (Studi e Saggi, 6.) Pp. 147. Rome: Signorelli, 1955. Paper, L. 800.

In this study Ussani attempts to settle the several questions raised by the opening lines of the *Argonautica*. The difficulty lies in the single word *ille* in line 15. Does it refer to Titus or Domitian? If Titus is meant, then the words *delubraque genti instituet* cannot refer to the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* erected on the Quirinal by Domitian; if Domitian is meant, then the poem of the *Argonautica* must have been written after the death of Titus and at the earliest c. A.D. 89, the probable date of the consecration of the temple.

In the first chapter of this study Ussani reviews the theories of his predecessors with considerable thoroughness and in the second chapter he develops his own theory which may be briefly summarized as follows. The poem could not have been written after the completion of the poem, because the poem was not completed: it was probably written for the public recitation of part of the poem sometime shortly after A.D. 79, because of the references to the eruptions of Vesuvius in iii. 208-9, iv. 507-9, 686-8. From Quintilian's *multum in Valerio Flacco nuper amisimus* we are entitled to believe that Valerius died at some time during the years A.D. 88 to 90, as A.D. 91 is argued as the date for the composition of Book x of the *Institutio Oratoria*. The poem was known to Silius when he composed *Punica* iii. 571-629 c. A.D. 92/93, so that what was completed of the *Argonautica* must have been published by then. The *Argonautica* was probably started towards the close of Vespasian's reign and Valerius continued at work on it until his death in c. A.D. 88/90.

The arguments produced are generally cogent, but too much weight is put upon the interpretation of *nuper* in Quintilian. Admittedly Quintilian uses the word to cover a wide range of time. In x. I. 118 he uses it, as Ussani points out, of Domitius Afer and Iulius Africanus. Afer died in A.D. 59 and Africanus seems to have been his contemporary: *erant clara et nuper ingenia*, says Quintilian. But there is all the difference between referring to an author or orator of recent date (i.e. one who flourished during the last twenty-five years or so) and to a friend recently dead. The latter use of the word can only refer to a lapse of months, certainly not years. So we need not suppose that Quintilian means other than what he says. Nor need we suppose that he wrote the words much before the date of publication of his

work, which was probably as late as A.D. 96. The reminiscences of Valerius in Silius prove little or nothing.

In view of his theory Ussani believes that *ille* refers to Titus and that *delubraque genti instituet* refers to the Temple of Vespasian in the Forum. It is therefore a surprise to find him reading *gentis* (which makes the case for the *Templum Gentis Flaviae* even stronger) rather than the *genti* of VS.

The third chapter contains a useful discussion of the poem from the point of view of the Imperial Cult, in which it is pointed out that the adulation is here addressed to an emperor who is already dead.

The book contains an index of passages quoted, and an index of modern authors. There are some slips in the references that I have checked: XXX should be XXXI on p. 32 n. (6) and 1889 should be 1899 on p. 57 n. (1). A list of books and articles mentioned in the notes would help the reader, who soon wearies of the incessant op. cit. and ibid.

J. H. BISHOP

University of Edinburgh

JOANNES ALBERTUS MARIA VAN DER LINDEN: *Een speciaal gebruik van de ablativus absolutus bij Caesar*. Pp. 128. Obtainable from the author at Dubbeldamsweg 61, Dordrecht. Paper, fl. 6.50.

DR. VAN DER LINDEN examines the paranormal use of the ablative absolute in Caesar. After some general discussion three chapters analyse instances of identity between the ablative absolute group and either the subject or, within wide limits, the complement of the main sentence. A further chapter considers *Periphere Gevalen*. Two main divisions emerge. In the first the paranormal element is regarded as deliberately softened, either for external reasons due to desire for parallelism (in B.C. ii. 22. 1, for example, the reader should perceive that *diversis legionibus* balances *saepibusq. d. interiectis*), for internal reasons, due sometimes to extension of the abl. abs. group or use of more than one such group (both conditions tending to conceal identity), sometimes to breaking down of identity (B.C. iii. 1. 1, for example), with differing approach verbally more or less obvious (B.C. ii. 19. 4, for example, *cohortes* ironically repeated: B.G. vii. 53. 1, *contiones* ... *militibus* personal but *legiones* ... *aciem* an

impersonal mass-reference). In the second division the paranormal element is claimed to be deliberately exploited for structural or stylistic reasons: separation, contrast, development of events, clarity, emphasis.

The complexity of the conclusions appears in the schematic presentation (pp. 104-5). Interlocking of explanations is not surprising; but one notes also occasional interlocking between the two main divisions, the 'excuserende' and 'exploiterende motieven'. *B.C.* ii. 10. 7, for example, appears both under the former (duplicated abl. abs.) and under the latter (stylistic emphasis). Whether or not one accepts the basic assumption that a writer, because he justly bears a high literary reputation, must therefore consciously follow complex but definable rules in a fundamentally logical turn of speech which is only incidental compared with normal usage—and apparently uninfluenced, we are told, by any Greek parallels—this thesis remains an acute and helpful study, and some of the points made merit consideration by editors; see, for example, apart from some of the passages already referred to, the comments on *B.G.* vii. 25. 3 (p. 77); on *B.C.* i. 75. 1 (p. 89; *Afranio* codd., not *Afranius* Kindscher, Klotz 1950) (cf. pp. 91-92 on *B.G.* i. 35. 1, vii. 6. 1); on *B.C.* iii. 9. 3 (p. 77; his with TVWUR: om. Klotz) (cf. p. 78 on *B.G.* iv. 2. 2). But in an attempt to analyse Caesarian thought-patterns within so restricted a field much of the material is readily susceptible of subjective treatment and the conclusions need to be submitted, as the author suggests, to stringent test by unprejudiced examination of evidence elsewhere.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK

King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne,
University of Durham

REMO GIOMINI: *Saggio sulla 'Fedra' di Seneca*. (Studi e Saggi, 5.) Pp. 124. Rome: Signorelli, 1955. Paper, L. 800.

THERE is enough interest nowadays in Seneca to ensure an interested reception for a 108-page essay on one of his plays if it had something of substance, not to say novelty, to communicate, if, for example, we were given something comparable to Professor Enk's recent pronouncements on the *Thyestes*. Mr. Giomini confuses the functions of the critic and the panegyrist, and an uninformed reader would suppose that he was discussing a So-

phocles, a Shakespeare, or an Ibsen ('meraviglioso', 'mirabile', 'stupendo', 'finissima intuizione'). A tone of unrelieved excitement and intensity prevails, which soon becomes ludicrous and finally tedious. 'Il fondamento della creazione artistica, che in Seneca ha orizzonti vastissimi'; 'con magistrale finezza e con singolare accorgimento'; 'arte sottilissima'; 'una penetrazione sempre più profonda del carattere': such are the ever-recurring declarations of an idolatry calculated to antagonize more than anyone the reader sympathetic to Seneca and therefore most impatient of such maladroit advocacy. Nor will Seneca's admirers admire him more for hearing others depreciated, as Giomini seems to imagine when (pp. 31 ff.) he disparages Ovid and exaggerates his licentiousness in the *Heroides*. At this point it is my unpleasant duty also to point out that the classical public is unlikely to think more highly of Mr. Paratore, the General Editor of the series and the contributor of Giomini's *Prefazione*, merely because Giomini habitually cites him with fawning assent at the expense of rival critics. The other authority whom Giomini most readily quotes is himself as editor of the *Phaedra* in the 'Collana di testi critici latini'.

After a preliminary discussion of 'general problems' and of the sources (Sophocles, Euripides, Ovid), the work assumes the form of a literary commentary on the successive episodes and choruses. It would have promoted most readers' convenience if the author, in giving the references according to his own edition, had added those of Richter's Teubner text. The encomiastic attitude persists almost from beginning to end, and, where such Senecan defects as rhetorical tirades or pseudo-philosophical clichés cannot be dissimulated, the soft pedal is applied (e.g. pp. 45 ff. and 83 ff.). Textual and interpretational problems are virtually ignored; if it is objected that the author's edition was the place for these, the fact is that the present essay contains little that could not have been comfortably compressed and included in his introduction and commentary.

One or two points: *forsitan* in l. 225 does not mean 'certamente' (p. 49), and *Phaedra's* attitude is, therefore, not 'assoluto egoismo', but a pathetic hoping against hope. In ll. 713 ff. Hippolytus is not thinking of the contamination of bloodshed (p. 67), but of *Phaedra's* impure contact. Imitation by Racine or D'Annunzio (pp. 85-86) is irrelevant to 'l'originalità dell' interpretazione senecana'.

W. S. MAGUINNESS

King's College, London

Publius Cornelius Tacitus: *Die historischen Versuche—Agricola, Germania, Dialogus*. Übersetzt und herausgegeben von KARL BÜCHNER. Pp. 334. Stuttgart: A. Kröner, 1955. Cloth, DM. 9.80.

TRANSLATIONS of the *Agricola*, *Germania*, and *Dialogus* form the core of this volume; there is a general introduction giving an account of Tacitus' life and his attitude towards the writing of history, a separate introduction to each translation, and over fifty pages of notes, in which bibliographical references are given and questions of reading and interpretation are discussed.

Büchner starts from the assumption that for Tacitus the aim of history was to pass judgement on historically significant personages. This aim, proclaimed in *Ann.* iii. 65, is exemplified by his treatment of the death of Otho, where as F. Klingner has shown (*Sbb.* Leipzig 92, 1940) Tacitus has altered the traditional account, because he regarded it as inconsistent with the character of the protagonists. The *Agricola* is neither a vague panegyric nor a mere catalogue of success; rather it is an appraisal of Agricola's character in action. As an 'evaluation of his historical greatness in the service of truth' it is closely bound up with what Tacitus regarded as the aim of historical writing. In the *Germania* the country's geography is dismissed in six lines (c. 5 in.). In the first half (to c. 27) the main aim is to show how among the Germans *uirtus* and *honos* govern their conduct in both public and private life. In the second half, especially in the description of the Suebic tribes, the leading 'Baugedanke' is the conception of *libertas*. A whole people devoting its life to the pursuit of *uirtus* and possessing in freedom the essential condition for its full realization must have seemed to Tacitus an historical subject in the truest sense of the word. Büchner regards the *Dialogus* as certainly by Tacitus and certainly later than the *Agricola* and *Germania*. The optimism of the *Agricola* (the new régime has combined *res olim dissociabilis, principatum ac libertatem*) has been replaced by the pessimism which Büchner believes to underlie Maternus' final speech—his insistence on the 'blessings of peace' is not to be taken at its face value. This would indicate for the *Dialogus* a date in the first decade of the second century A.D. Inasmuch as it finds the basic cause for the decline of eloquence in the loss of political freedom, the *Dialogus* is, in Büchner's view, equally with the *Agricola* and *Germania*, a 'historischer Versuch'.

Büchner's text, which has to be inferred from his translation and notes, is generally conservative, e.g. *Agr.* 31. 22 he retains *laturi* (intransitive, cf. *Nepos, Dat.* 4. 5). A few points of detail: *Agr.* 9. 25 he takes *egregiae tum spei* with *consul*, not *filiae*; *Germ.* 6. 12 *dextros agunt* "'sie treiben die rechten an"' d. h. machen eine Gesamtschwenkung nach links': *Agr.* 6. 19 *uti . . . ita* 'weit . . . entfernt, und darum um so näher'—surely 'though . . . yet'? *Agr.* 44. 2 'er schied im 56. Jahre' translates the manuscript reading, but requires comment (or emendation), as it was in fact his 54th year. *Dial.* 26. 22 *plerumque deiectus*(?): it is not clear what reading is represented by the translation 'fällt sehr oft aus der Rolle'.

R. H. MARTIN

University of Leeds

Cornelio Tácito: *Historias*, libro cuarto. Edición y comentario por M. BASSOLS DE CLIMENT. (Clásicos 'Emerita'.) Pp. xvi+200. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1955. Paper.

PROFESSOR BASSOLS DE CLIMENT has already published editions of the three preceding books of Tacitus' Histories in 1943, 1946, 1951. The present volume lays particular emphasis on the elucidation of points of grammatical and historical interest. The text, which is virtually that of Koestermann's 1950 Teubner edition, has no critical apparatus, and only rarely are variant readings discussed in the notes. The notes are printed in smaller type under the text on the same page. Many words and phrases are translated, especially where the Latin idiom is different from the Spanish. Historical and factual details and allusions are briefly explained in the notes and frequent reference is made to the Index of Names and the Index of Technical Terms. In the latter the meaning is explained of such terms as *centurio*, *cohors* (in its various senses), *legio*; but Bassols should not at 68. 8 refer his reader to the index for an explanation of *annonae*, which does not appear there. The most noteworthy feature of the edition, as might be expected from Bassols, who has published so far two (of a projected seven) volumes of a *Sintaxis histórica de la lengua latina*, is its emphasis on grammar and syntax. In addition to a simple explanation of the idiom involved, often accompanied by a translation of the passage in which it occurs, Bassols frequently refers to the appropriate section in works on Latin

syntax, such as Kühner-Stegmann, Hofmann (in Müller's *Handbuch*), Ernout-Thomas, and Bassols's own *Sintaxis histórica*.

If the aim is excellent, the execution is less satisfactory. I have noted about forty misprints in the text. Most of these are more irritating than misleading. But if in 22. 9-10 the student can restore *obtinens* (omitted in the text) . . . in *aduersum amnem* (text in *aduersus amnem*) from the notes, he will be puzzled by *solicitor* . . . *miserarium* . . . *miretque* (for *solicitor* . . . *miseriarum* . . . *miseretque*) at 58. 2-3, unless he has another text to refer to. In the grammatical notes, among much that is sound and instructive, inaccuracy or misunderstanding is too frequent. The following is only a sample. 2. 4 *summa potentiae* in Primo Antonio] *summa* is interpreted as neuter plural adjective. 37. 13-14 'The ablative of cause (*satiētie*) is coordinated with the *quia* clause.' Even if *quia* (an emendation) is read, the coordination is between *satiētie* and *incruentati* (or *incruenti*). 39. 27 sic *egesto quicquid turbidum*] 'sc. esse . . . No es clásico que una oración de infinitivo haga las veces de sujeto de una ablativo absoluta.' This is plain nonsense: sc. *erat*. 46. 17 *distrāhi* *coepere*] 'The infinitive has a reflexive force; consequently the main verb is not attracted into the form *coēpta sunt*.' I doubt whether *distrāhi* is middle, but in any case more to the point is the fact that Tacitus never uses *coēptus sum* with a passive infinitive. Here, as elsewhere, Bassols is too ready to follow Goelzer's statements. 53. 23 in *aliud destinātō*] 'Only here does T. construe *destināre* with *in*.' But cf. ii. 56. 6 in *praedam* . . . *aut ad exēdium destinābant*. 55. 15 *talibus inceptis abhorrebat*] 'Livio usa con frecuencia el dativo.' Where, apart from ii. 14? 57. 15 *locutus*] 'sc. est'. Why? *locutus* is a straightforward participle. 80. 12 *nimius commemorandis quae meruisset*] If I understand Bassols aright, he explains *commemorandis* as ablative of the gerund equivalent to a present participle, referring the reader to Hofmann p. 600. 85. 10 *fractae*] 'sc. *forent vel essent*'. Tacitus has anticipated Bassols.

R. H. MARTIN

University of Leeds

JOANNA NIEMIRSKA-PLISZCZYŃSKA:
*De elocutione Pliniana in epistularum
libris novem conspicua quaestiones selectae*.
Pp. 168. Lublin: Biblioteka Uni-
wersytecka, 1955. Paper.

This little book has an attractive ingenuousness that almost disarms criticism. It has

evidently been a labour of love, and it is distasteful to say 'love's labour's lost' of a writer so enamoured of her author that she seeks no novelties to commend him to our attention. The most a reviewer can do is wonder, and gently ask, for what sort of public the book is designed. It is written in a Latin whose endearing simplicity recalls the childish gravity of Alice in Wonderland. With guileless candour it acknowledges its indebtedness to modern authorities for such items of information as the following: that Pliny was adopted by the elder Pliny, who was his maternal uncle (p. 5); that adjectives are used '*abundantiae causa, ut imaginem pleniorē reddant*' (p. 29); that a letter is '*sermoni cotidiano et vitae cotidianaē proxima*' (p. 66); that onomatopoeia is not an exact reproduction of sounds¹ (p. 132); and that Silver Age prose is characterized by *color poeticus* (p. 143). The author quotes with considerable frequency from a small store of reference books and is apparently unaware of the existence of even the first edition of Schuster's Teubner Text, published in 1933. She can hardly be said to have unearthed any new facts about Pliny's style and usage, though there are passages here and there that would be instructive to the students into whose hands her book is unlikely to fall (e.g. p. 29: reinforcement of neologisms by familiar synonyms; pp. 99-103: chiasmus; pp. 143-57: '*color poeticus*'). The mechanical processes of citation and classification are rarely enlivened by analysis or comparison, and discussion is rudimentary. Pliny is treated almost *in vacuo*, the existence of the antecedents whose literary successor he was is almost ignored, and, in spite of perfunctory references to 'the literary circle of Pliny, Quintilian, and Tacitus', the literary relationship between Tacitus and Pliny is, it seems, regarded as of little interest.

The contents of the book are as follows: Praefatio (Pliny and the *epistula*); De Verborum Delectu (diminutives, compound verbs, abstract nouns, adjectives, adverbs, Greek words); De Molli et Blando Plinii Genere Dicendi (Pliny's manner of expressing affection); Parataxis and Hypotaxis; Metaphors and Comparisons; Figurae (anaphora, hyperbaton, chiasmus, antithesis, 'verborum lusus', 'gradatio', asyndeton, ellipsis, 'exclamatio', parenthesis, homoeoteleuton, 'interrogatio', onomatopoeia, alliteration); De Parallelismo; De Colore Poetico; Conclusio; Conspectus Fontium (Consoli, Guille-

¹ So might Professor Haldane's phonetic frogs in Romney Marshes have protested.

min, Marouzeau, Joseph Stalin, etc.); Index (scanty).

Misprints and errors of spelling are not infrequent.

W. S. MAGUINNESS

King's College, London

CHRISTINE MOHRMANN: *Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens, latin médiéval*. Pp. 54. Paris: Klincksieck, 1955. Paper, 240 fr.

THIS booklet contains reprints of three studies which have appeared elsewhere: 'Les formes du latin dit "vulgaire". Essai de chronologie et de systématisation de l'époque augustéenne aux langues romanes' (*Actes du premier Congrès de la Fédération internationale des Associations d'études classiques*, 1951, pp. 207-19, reprinted *Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens*, 1952); 'L'étude de la latinité chrétienne: état de la question, méthodes, résultats' (*Latin vulgaire, latin des chrétiens*, 1952); 'Le dualisme de la latinité médiévale' (*Revue des Études Latines*, xxix [1952], 330-48).

In the first article Professor Mohrmann points out that from the beginnings of Latin literature the literary language was distinguished from the spoken tongue, and maintained in face of pressure from the spoken tongue by a rigid system of education. Only long after the breakdown of the ancient educational system did there arise two languages, medieval Latin and a Romance language, out of the original one. For Mohrmann vulgar Latin is a real language, discernible through and in spite of the classicizing framework of most Latin writing: its investigation is the province of the classical scholar. The reconstructions of the Romance philologist are useful, but only as an additional check on what can be learned from ancient texts.

In the second essay, after glancing at the history of the study of Christian Latin (the names of Ozanam, Koffmane, Bonnet, Goelzer, and Löfstedt are the main landmarks), Mohrmann expounds at length the view developed by her teacher Schrijnen and herself of Christian Latin as a 'special' language of a non-ethnic group within a larger linguistic community. This section is the best introduction to the by now fairly extensive literature of the 'Schrijnen-Mohrmann School'. There follows a sketch of the historical development of Christian Latin, which suffers a little from over-compression. In a final section she examines some of the practical problems which faced Latin-speaking Christians in a society whose literary lan-

guage was closely linked with paganism. The comparison which she goes on to draw with the difficulties of Christian missionaries today does not seem entirely valid.

In the third study Mohrmann asks what kind of linguistic entity medieval Latin is, and by what standards works composed in it are to be judged and appreciated. Her approach is historical; the status and nature of medieval Latin changed with time and place. In the High Middle Ages, for instance, it is the direct continuation of literary Latin in Italy, where the old educational system was to some extent maintained, while in Gaul the continuity was broken, and from the Carolingian period onwards Latin was learned as a foreign language. In England it is the mainly written language of church and culture, introduced and supported by direct contact with Italy, while in most Germanic-speaking lands there was no such direct contact with an area of continuous Latin tradition. Later in the Middle Ages the differences level out, and developed medieval Latin is a 'Kunstsprache' maintained by a non-ethnic collectivity, the world of learning, the *respublica clericorum*. The similar position of medieval Hebrew is briefly glanced at. It is thus a living language, though not the language of any single people. Hence it cannot be judged by the standards of pure classicism. The men of the Middle Ages used the heritage of antiquity for their own purposes; they did not try to recreate antiquity. By the twelfth century medieval Latin had become an autonomous literary language, with its own standards, and not an exercise in imitation.

Every page of these highly compressed and delightfully written essays gives much food for thought, even if it does not always convince.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

ERNEST WILL: *Exploration archéologique de Délos faite par l'École Française d'Athènes*. Fascicule xxii: *Le Dôdeka-théon*. Pp. 191; 63 figs., 16 pages of plates, 9 sheets of drawings. Paris: de Boccard, 1955. Portfolio, cloth-backed.

THIS *temenos*, between the Letoon and the Civic Buildings, was excavated seventy years ago. R. Vallois, using the Delian accounts (notably *I.G.* xi. 2. 158), identified it in *B.C.H.* 1929 as the Dodekathéon; and Mar-

cadé in *B.C.H.* 1950 reconstructed part of what he considered an archaic group of the Twelve Gods. The extant temple was clearly built much later, and Ch. Picard wished to attribute it to Demetrius Poliorcetes, whose features he saw in a colossal head published by Will on his plate xv.

Will now offers the first close study of the remains, of which many (including the small objects) have disappeared since the excavation. He concludes that the precinct and peribolos existed in the seventh century, and that of the two altars aligned on the main east façade of the temple the more distant, D, existed in the fourth, while the nearer, A, was built with the temple about 300 B.C. The base for the cult-statues was enlarged at least once after this; but, despite Marcadé, the archaic group was never brought into the cella. Picard's head, of a diademed prince, points to the fostering interest of some Hellenistic monarch. But the features hardly recall Demetrius. Nor do inscriptions offer the evidence they had seemed to do for an 'Altar of the Kings'. Apart from a burst of splendour, c. 300 B.C., the cult never really prospered. But an actual temple to the Twelve Gods is seemingly unique, and refutes Weinreich's contention that they were worshipped in *tholoi*.

The Doric temple was hexastyle amphiprostyle, echoing that of the Athenians. Will's restoration, obviously correct in its main lines, shows columns some seven lower diameters high, without entasis, and an entablature and pediment together just half the column-height. The walls had an external batter, and enough of the south-west anta survives to give us both this and its own height. Owing to the excessive angle-contraction, the metopes varied greatly. The corner-triglyphs were given twice the usual projection, so actually overhung the architrave. (In Hellenistic Delos, metopes might vary grossly in size—*Delos*, xx, fig. 53—and even ordinary triglyphs overhang—*Delos*, ii, 1, p. 19. But are such features as early as 300 B.C., Will's presumed date here?) The unit of design is the foot of 33 cm., the height of the stylobate, and the normal wall-course. On the lowest step, the building measured 30 × 50 ft.

It is hard to see how Will reaches the exact column-height from the surviving drums. They vary in size and treatment. He finds some grille-holes, all, he thinks, once at the same height. But, whether circular (p. 28) or square (pl. v), they seem low for the top of a grille half the height of the columns, as he restores it (p. 35; cf. *Hesperia*, 1950, p. 169). He does not illustrate the surviving

column-drums sufficiently. The south-west anta remains the best check.

If the cross-walls had fewer 'through'-courses than the side walls, it is possibly because the builders had many small blocks on their hands, not because the front cross-wall was thrown out of joint by the orthostates of the pronaos. Will sets these one course higher than the other orthostates—a very questionable feature of his restoration, which ties him in a knot. See his fig. 49.

I also quarrel with his architrave. It is only five-sevenths the height of the frieze, less than in any contemporary building (p. 140: the New Temple of Samothrace approaches it, according to Will, but not according to Schober or to *Samothrace*, ii, pl. 13). Will knows its height only from an alleged architrave-backer, his fig. 52, which has, however, a design unique for such a position.

Most of this book is clear and full, and the illustration as lavish as we have come to expect in French architectural publications. I have noted only one serious discrepancy in the pictures. Fig. 16 shows the raking corona dying away in the normal 'feather-edge', whereas fig. 23 shows it returned on top of the horizontal corona, along the sides of the temple. Pl. vi, 5, a photograph of the corner-block, suggests that fig. 16 is right.

HUGH PLOMMER

Museum of Classical Archaeology, Cambridge

J. M. R. CORMACK: *Notes on the History of the Inscribed Monuments of Aphrodisias*. Pp. 65; 14 figs. Reading: University of Reading Press, 1955. Cloth.

Those who measure scholarship solely by the weight and length of a publication might be inclined to overlook this slim volume. Yet into its 65 pages has gone patient and protracted research, illuminated and sustained by epigraphic skill and a detailed knowledge of the monuments whose history, from 1705 onwards, forms the subject of the monograph. Professor Cormack has collated and documented all the publications of inscriptions of Aphrodisias from Sherard to the present, together with unpublished data from the notebooks of Reichel and Kubitschek, reviewing them all in the light of the finds made by Sir W. M. Calder's expedition in 1934. The inscriptions are listed first under their number in *C.I.G.* and cross-referenced in the lists of later publications, where also stones

discovered after Boeckh's time appear under their respective *editiones principes*. An appendix gives an interesting account of Sherard's journeys and the fate of his transcripts.

This study brings into relief not only the movement of stones from one place to another, but the high casualty rate that has existed among them. Stones have reached Aphrodisias or left it since Sherard's day, and many of those copied by earlier travellers have either been lost altogether or have survived in fragments often republished as new finds by later editors. Cormack has ably tracked down this kind of 'dittography', and illustrations of a few outstanding examples are given at the end of the book.

The loss of stones did not occur in greatest part, as one might expect, between 1700 and 1890, although 40 per cent. of those seen by Sherard have not been seen since. Losses have been equally great in more recent times, and the evidence here given raises, as an urgent problem for the authorities, the proper care and preservation of inscribed stones in Asia Minor and elsewhere.

The University of Reading Press is to be congratulated on the production of this little book, which augurs well for the quality of its future work. Finally, it is to be hoped that the epigraphy of other sites may attract from scholars the treatment here given to Aphrodisias, and that the publication of *M.A.M.A.* vol. viii, to which this work forms a pendant, will not be long delayed.

GEOFFREY WOODHEAD

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge

HELGE LYNGBY: *Beiträge zur Topographie des Forum-Boarium-Gebietes in Rom*. Testimonien nebst Kommentar und kritischem Apparat. (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 8°, vii.) Pp. xxvi+148; 5 plans, 2 plates. Lund. Gleerup, 1954. Paper, Kr. 25.

LYNGBY is mainly concerned here with topographical cruces arising over the relationship and sites of the cult-centres of Hercules in the Forum Boarium, and over the line of the Republican walls in the same area. His book is divided into three sections, the first dealing with Hercules, the other two with problems related to the line of the walls.

In the first section he works from a new theory that the cult of Hercules Invictus can be distinguished from that of Hercules Vi-

ctor. His main points are: (a) that Hercules Invictus is the god of the Ara Maxima and its associated temple, both of which should be located near the Circus Maximus, beside, rather than in, the Forum Boarium—the temple being identical with that of Hercules Pompeianus which was described by Vitruvius as in the Etruscan style; (b) that Hercules Victor was worshipped in a temple actually in the Forum Boarium, and in fact in the round temple destroyed by Sixtus IV rather than in the round temple of Hercules in the Forum Boarium mentioned by Livy x. 23. 3—Livy's temple being more probably the surviving round temple in Piazza Bocca della Verità, whose cult-statue (if, as Lyngby thinks, it is represented on the Portunus panel of the Arch of Trajan at Beneventum) shows a different manifestation of Hercules; (c) that both Hercules Victor and Hercules Invictus had second cult-centres near the Porta Trigemina.

The theory is ingenious and based on an exacting analysis of the sources. If accepted, it would certainly introduce order into an otherwise confused picture; although the proliferation of similar cults of Hercules in close proximity to one another would still be remarkable. Its basis, however, in the precise distinction of the two cults seems to need more discussion than it receives here. The pre-Julian Fasti Antiaties record a feast of Hercules Victor on the Ides of August, on which date the Fasti Allifani have one of Hercules Invictus. Since other feasts recorded under that date by the Fasti Antiaties recur under the same date in the Allifani, the probability of the identity of the two for Hercules seems stronger than Lyngby allows. However, for those who feel that there is little evidence for his distinction in the pre-Augustan and Augustan sources, he offers an alternative possibility, that the distinction was a development of imperial date. This too is not wholly satisfactory; *C.I.L.* vi. 328 of A.D. 81, *Herculi Victori pollenti invicto*, although it does not come from the Forum Boarium, nevertheless suggests that in the late first century the two titles were not felt to be exclusive; and *C.I.L.* vi. 319 of the third century A.D., invoking *Argive Victor Hercules*, which is apparently one of a group of dedications made by urban praetors at the Ara Maxima, seems to be dismissed altogether too lightly.

The second section resolves itself almost exclusively into a discussion of the location of the city gates. Porta Trigemina Lyngby regards as fixed by Gatti's identification of the Porticus Aemilia near the south-west end of the Aventine, and Porta Carmentalis by

that of the Temples of Fortuna and Mater Matuta with the remains under S. Omobono. In the position between Porta Carmentalis and the Tiber which is commonly allotted to Porta Flumentana he places Porta Navalis; Porta Flumentana he would have on the south-west side of the Aventine; the highly controversial Porta Triumphalis he believes to have been the central arch of the Porta Carmentalis. The third section is virtually a brief appendix to the second. In it Lyngby's purpose is to dissociate the *carceres* of the Circus Maximus from the city wall and therefore from the *duodecim portae* of Pliny.

Lyngby's collection of evidence, which includes some matter not previously brought into connexion with the problems discussed, will be extremely useful to topographers. On many of the problems, however, the evidence is neither sufficiently extensive nor sufficiently precise to form the basis for sure conclusions. His solutions can only be conjectures. His method of presenting them is not, perhaps, the most convenient that could have been chosen. He begins with a résumé—very briefly summarizing previous views of the problems and his own solutions; after which the book becomes, as its sub-title indicates, a reprinting of the relevant texts with apparatus criticus and a commentary on each item or group of items, together with a description of and similar commentary on the archaeological material. The result, especially in the first section, gives the impression of a note-book, the raw material for a study. On this method it is not always possible to establish first things first, or to keep clearly before the reader's mind the relation of points to one another. In addition the reader might fairly expect more help from accompanying illustrations. There are some; but this is not a book that can be intelligently read by one who has not provided himself already with some plan of ancient Rome and, if possible, a street map of modern Rome.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College, Cambridge

ADA HONDIUS-CRONE: *The Temple of Nehalennia at Domburg*. Pp. 123; ill. Amsterdam: J. M. Meulenhoff, 1955. Cloth.

THE shrine of Nehalennia, near Domburg on Walcheren Island, first came to light in January 1647, after winter gales had denuded the sandhills covering it; its site now lies some 20 feet below sea-level at low tide,

550 yards out to sea from the modern coastline. The original discovery included a good many inscribed stones, one of them dedicated by a *negotiator cretarius Britannicianus*; they attracted much attention from continental scholars and were made known to English readers by Gale's *Iter Britanniarum* (1709)—the source of Horsley's reference to the goddess as 'the patroness of the chalk-workers'. Other finds were made at varying intervals, the most recent being part of an altar drawn up in his net by a fisherman in 1935. Most of the collection was preserved in Domburg church until its destruction by fire in 1848, when many of the stones were lost or damaged; after further vicissitudes, the surviving pieces were removed for safe custody (and jumbled in the process) during the recent war. Ada Hondius-Crone was charged with sorting them out again, and that was the genesis of the present book. It is written in English, abundantly illustrated, furnished with footnotes (at the end) which bear witness to wide and methodical reading, and closes with a concordance of epigraphic and other references to the stones and a key to the illustrations. The text begins with a careful history of the discoveries and a description of the find-spot and its setting; then comes an elaborate catalogue of the finds, printed on art paper and copiously illustrated by photographs of the surviving stones, drawings by the early antiquaries, and some comparative material from elsewhere (including the Lydney dog); the last chapter gives a brief analysis of the iconography of the cult and of its associations with those of other deities—Neptune, Hercules, Jupiter, and Victory.

Nehalennia's association with shipping, dogs, and fruit gives her a special interest; so does her costume, a short cape over her cloak differentiating her from the *Matronae* of the Rhineland whom in other respects she resembles. Her votaries included *peregrini*, and most of them have Celtic or German names; the author inclines to date the whole series to the beginning of the third century, but several texts seem better assigned on epigraphic grounds to the second. The cult is attested elsewhere only by two altars at Deutz, across the Rhine from Cologne; she suggests that they had been made by a monumental mason there, and were intended to be shipped downstream to the Domburg sanctuary. Geological examination shows that the Domburg stones all come from the limestone quarries near Metz which the Romans worked extensively; by their style, the sculptures might all have been produced in the Cologne district.

An excellent book, which should stimulate comparable studies of local cults.

ERIC BARLEY

Hatfield College, Durham

GINO VINICIO GENTILI: *Auximum (Osimo)*. (Italia Romana: Municipi e Colonie, ser. i, vol. xv.) Pp. 12 + 162; 9 figs., 20 plates, 3 plans. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1955. Paper. L. 1,000.

GENTILI first surveys briefly the history of settlement at Auximum and in its territory from prehistoric to Byzantine times and then describes the major monuments of Roman and early-Christian character surviving in the town and its neighbourhood. In an appendix he adds the relevant literary and epigraphic evidence—a useful collection of the material, although its arrangement (as a result of which there is, for example, no reference to Livy xli. 27 under the heading *Storia*) seems in some respects inconvenient.

The archaeological chapters, together with that section of the historical survey which deals with pre-Roman Auximum and is in fact largely a review of the archaeological evidence, would clearly constitute a most helpful guide to the major local antiquities for anyone on the spot; and seems sufficiently detailed to indicate to the reader at a distance whether these include anything of particular interest to him. There is a reasonable amount of good illustration. A map and a street-plan make it possible to follow geographical references satisfactorily. Minor finds of the Roman period are not, however, discussed at all. The picture created is, therefore, wholly of the more grandiose aspects of life, and for the most part of public life.

The historical chapters are less vivid. It is true of course that the literary evidence is sparse and scrappy. But the chronological distribution of the inscriptions and other monuments should have given some clues and the neglected minor objects could perhaps have added information—at the least about the commercial relations of the town at different periods. Too much space, it may be thought, is given to not very informative comment on the list of gentile names attested in the area; and not enough to discussion of points that would lift the account out of its local limitations, set it clearly in the context of the history of Rome and of Italy, explain what is part of wider trends, and show illuminatingly what is genuinely local idiosyn-

crasy. Significant in this connexion seems the author's avoidance of discussion of the date of the foundation of the Roman colony. Velleius' date, 154, is accepted without question in the text; a footnote indicates that there has been controversy and gives references to advocates of other dates; but the nature of the problem is nowhere considered.

On a point of detail: in the inscription published as no. 3 on p. 154 (see also p. 47) AVG should almost certainly be completed as *aug(ur)* not as *Aug(ustalis)*.

J. M. REYNOLDS

Newnham College, Cambridge

B. A. KALOGERAS: *Ενυβολή στη διαβάθμιση του επιθέτου της αρχαίας Έλληνικῆς*. Pp. 57. Salonika, 1955. Paper.

PROFESSOR KALOGERAS's thesis is 'an attempt . . . to give an objective solution' to the many serious problems of Greek comparison (p. 9). It claims to offer a fully analytic proof only in the case of questions here posed for the first time; even so, the reader may justifiably wonder how profitably so many topics can be treated in fewer than fifty pages of discussion. The sections on the superlative are little to set beside Thesleff's recent study, but there is rather fuller treatment of the comparative, in which some interesting views are proposed, though insufficiently discussed. For example, defective comparison is held to be part proof that the superlative is related to the positive directly, not via the comparative; the suffix *-ιος-τος* consequently requires delicate handling, during which Benveniste, *Noms d'agent*, etc., p. 144, is misrepresented. Priority of superlative to comparative is taken as demonstrated by the order in which their respective uses are acquired by infants, with appeal to a questionable analogy with 'the linguistic infancy and childhood of man'. It is reasonably suggested that the suffix *-τερος* acquired its comparative use from adjectives, such as *πρότερος*, *νέωτερος*, in which the expression of contrast was accompanied by an implication of degree. The best elaborated sections are those containing a classification of comparative usages under such heads as 'comparison of likeness', 'comparison of contrast', the latter being subdivided into simple, relative, and ameliorative (*βελτιωτική*) comparison. The difficulty of completely distinguishing these sub-types is underlined by the use of *Od.* ii. 29 to illustrate both the first and the second. Turning to the superlative,

Kalogeras maintains that its genitive is always partitive, never ablative, and continues with a brief treatment of other aspects, including its subsequent replacement by the comparative.

There remain some weaknesses of method and detail. 'The psychological law of comparison and likeness' (p. 11), 'the psychological law of likeness and contrast' (p. 30) play a role like that of Molière's *vis dormitiva*. There is insufficient probing of comparative questions. Benveniste's view of the function of *-to- in superlatives and ordinals is rejected partly on the irrelevant ground that Greek has no ordinals in -ιστος. The theory that a 'superlative' *-to- became Greek -ατος with a form false division of, for example, ἀδελφάτος, ἀνοίρατος, and then -τατος with τ from -ρεπος, involves considerable improbabilities and neglects the relationship of these forms with those of other languages. The statement (p. 42) that Sanskrit adjectives in -fyan- have only intensive meaning, whatever its intention, may appear to suggest that -fyan- is not a comparative suffix. The bibliography presents some curiosities, chief of which is to cite Meillet's famous *Introduction* in a German translation of 1909.

D. M. JONES

Westfield College, London

ARMAND ABEL: *Le Roman d'Alexandre, légendaire médiéval*. (Collections Lebeque et Nationale, 112). Pp. 131; 5 plates. Brussels, Office de Publication, 1955. Paper, 65 B. fr.

THE author of this book is professor at the Oriental Institute of the Université Libre of Brussels and appears equally at home in the literature of Islam and in the medieval romances of western Europe. He is, therefore, exceptionally well equipped to discuss the Alexander Romance and his book will delight students of the classics who enjoy following the expansion and transformation of classical themes beyond the limits of the strictly classical world. He begins by offering a quite detailed summary of Pseudo-Callisthenes, with insistence on the differences between the three recensions, A, B, and C. He is well aware that Alexander began to pass from the realm of history into the realm of romance as early as Hellenistic times (it might have been worth while to add a sentence or two about the evidence of papyrus texts here); and he shows that many elements of the romance are already to be found in Plutarch and Quintus Curtius and Pliny's

Natural History (he might have added Diodorus and Strabo and their Hellenistic sources). But, as he explains, the Romance in its subsequent development is Alexandrian and non-European, including elements of Jewish origin which can be found in the Talmud. Alexander's father is now supposed to be an Egyptian or even a Persian, so that Alexander is regarded as a brother of the Darius whom he conquers; and as time goes on his conquests come to include the entire Roman world and extend as far as China and Tibet. As Dhû'l Qarneyn ('he of the Two Horns') he comes to be a prophet of the One God, who built the wall against Gog and Magog at God's bidding, concerning whom Mohammed expects to be questioned by Jewish scholars, and a type of the man who learns to estimate worldly desires and ambitions at their true values.

Examples of the Oriental style in presenting Alexander are given from Tabari's *Annals* and his commentary on the Koran, from Mas'ûdî, Tha'alabî, Firdûsî, and Nizâmî. Then after this excursion into Moslem literature, the author returns to Europe and outlines more briefly the different treatment of Alexander in the medieval Latin and French romances (and the subsequent versions in other European languages), where he appears as a model of chivalry.

The plates include three fine illustrations from the Brussels Manuscript no. 11040, which show Alexander investigating the bottom of the sea in his glass case, fighting the one-eyed giants, and constructing the wall against Gog and Magog; and examples of the sculpture in French churches showing the strange creatures from the ends of the earth which the Alexander Romances had apparently made familiar to the masons—including the 'skia pod' from the cathedral of Sens who shades his head with his foot.

This is an absorbing little book and particularly valuable since some of the Arabic works which are discussed have not been translated into English and the French translations cited by Abel and in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* were made nearly a century ago.

LIONEL PEARSON

Stanford University

GIORGIO BRUGNOLI: *Studi sulle Differenzialie Verborum*. (Studi e Saggi, 7.) Pp. 382. Rome: Signorelli, 1955. Paper, L. 2,400.

In preparation for an *edizione complessiva e critica* Brugnoli examines the attributions to nomi

illustri dell' antichità classica of a number of collections of *differentiae*, whose kinship he also demonstrates. He successively discusses the attributions (most of which are to be rejected) of the (undefined) *Synonyma Ciceronis*; the *inter polliceri* (= *De proprietate sermonum vel rerum*) attributed to Isidore, and the related *inter metum* (also attributed to Cicero); the *Differentiae Suetonii* (= *inter accidit*), a defective alphabetical version of the *inter polliceri*; the *Differentiae Palaemonis* (= *inter gnatum*); the *Differentiae Probi* (= *inter austrum*); the *Differentiae Frontonis* (= *inter ultionem*), also attributed to Pliny and Charisius; the *inter aptum*, attributed to Isidore along with the *inter deum* (= *differentiae spirituales*) and the already mentioned *inter polliceri*. Briefly treated are the more extensive *inter absconditum* (the collection edited by Beck, with which Cicero's name is—absurdly—associated), and the related *inter auferre* (= Sangallensis 225, ff. 33^r–44^v): mentioned are some later collections, as well as the *differentiae* attributed to Terentius Scaurus, the fragmentary list of Widmann, and the *differentiae* of the *Liber Glossarum*.

Brugnoli's discussions, including those on the motivation of attributions, are often both illuminating and convincing, though objection to some arguments and views propounded is possible. The nature of the inquiry demands presentation of much material in tabular form; of 185 pages of text more than 18 per cent. is devoted to lists of *differentiae*. A further 185 pages contain a list of *concordantiae*, drawn from ten collections and comprising 3,975 entries of which 1,348 are cross-references. This list primarily demonstrates the interrelation of collections, but it also serves as an index to the works treated, showing their content and scope. The *differentiae* fall into three categories—those of synonyms; those of homonyms and homophones; and those of words with some phonetic similarity. The collections are valuable for the investigation both of ancient and medieval grammatical study and of later Latin, and both interests are served by the list of *concordantiae* which clearly shows the relative frequency of the *differentiae*: the numbers of unique *differentiae* (Beck's collection apart) are *inter aptum*, 266; *Diff. Frontonis*, 88; *inter polliceri*, 29; *Diff. Palaemonis*, 22; *cod. Sangallensis*, 18; *Diff. Probi*, 16; *Diff. Suetonii*, 5. A column noting the appearance of *differentiae* in other than *differentiae*-collections would have been a valuable addition: this kind of information is given, less clearly, in the *Testimonia* in Uhlfelder's edition of the *inter polliceri*.

The value of the list is, however, reduced by its mistakes. Examination of the *inter*

aptum column reveals omission of fifteen, and incorrect duplication of ten, numerical references. The *differentiae Beckii* column, which likewise shows fifteen omissions, and duplicates references, also erroneously numbers (D)89, *deportare* (= A89?); (F)247, *frux*; (P)88, *parere* (= A88?). A further defect is the absence of numerical references against certain *differentiae*: some of those given are incorrect. Some words are wrongly included, and others appear in an incorrect form due (at any rate partly) to the printer: such errors not infrequently occur in the text also. Due to the printer are faults in vertical or horizontal alignment in the table, and some awkward instances of carrying-over to a following page of words which belong to a *differentia*-group. The alphabetical arrangement of the list, according to the first element of the *differentiae*, could have been brought into greater prominence, and speed of reference increased, by indentation of the second and subsequent elements. Reference would be facilitated if words which are the first element of more than one *differentia* were numbered.

The faults of detail and the absence of a bibliography are to be regretted in a work as valuable as this, which in large part deserves the commendation given in the preface by the general editor of the series.

D. R. BRADLEY

University of Manchester

Langenscheidt's Greek-English Dictionary. By K. S. FEYERABEND. Pp. viii + 420. 3rd ed. London: Methuen (Berlin: Langenscheidt), 1955. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Langenscheidt's Latin-English Dictionary. By S. A. HANDFORD. Pp. 348. London: Methuen (Berlin: Langenscheidt), 1955. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

THE Greek dictionary in the Langenscheidt series is a reprint of Dr. Feyerabend's *Greek-English Dictionary*. It gives brief remarks on the history of Greek pronunciation, and (like its Latin counterpart) contains some 20,000 entries. Although the claim that these cover 'all the words which occur in the authors commonly read in schools and also those of the Greek New Testament' should not be taken entirely literally, and opinions may differ as to what authors, or even portions of authors, fall within this definition, examination suggests that omissions are likely to be

few, a
compo
πῆχυς
φίλων
phani
ὀρχίλο
shoul
cause-
γραμμ
the Pr
out of
of suc
denec
in a d
The
excess
and th
sive sl
editio
of a m
lent li
In
both
ford g
Latin
deal o
stand
and
sody
in tw
work
of the
Latin
are li
(1) so
fragm
word
write
Colum
Petro
occu
the fi
Plaut
have
Lind

Dr. J.
In
my c
what
discu
lack
Tere
my r

few, and mostly obvious or unimportant compounds—such as, for example, *δυωδεκάπηγος* (Hdt.) (similar compounds are given), *φλουρία*, *-ουινος* (Hdt., Plato); or some Aristophanic words like *φαλαρίς* (-ηρίς), *ναστός*, *ὀρχίλος*, *σέρφος*, *ὀψιμαθής* (Xen., Plato, Isocr.) should surely be included, the more so because—like *θορυβοποιέω*, *ἀλιτενής*, *παράγραμμα*, *μικροβρυχία* (or are Appian B.C. and the *Private Speeches* of Demosthenes now ruled out of school reading?)—it eases the problem of such Greek words in Cicero's correspondence as one can reasonably expect to find in a dictionary on this scale.

The Greek lettering, notably α, ρ, δ, shows excessive contrast between thick and thin and thus gives an intermittent illusion of curvilinear slope to a basically upright fount. A new edition might well consider the advantage of a major change here in an otherwise excellent little work.

In the same format and at the same price, both nicely suited to the pocket, Mr. Handford gives us an entirely revised edition of the *Latin-English Dictionary*. Some prefatory pages deal clearly and not too technically with outstanding points in the history, pronunciation and accent, syllabic construction and prosody of the language. Spelling is touched on in two pages of notes, which also define the work as a 'substantially complete vocabulary of the most widely read authors of classical Latin down to A.D. 140'. The chief authors are listed, with dates. Expressly excluded are: (1) some words occurring only in surviving fragments of lost works; (2) most of the words found only in inscriptions, in technical writers (e.g. Cato, Varro, Seneca the Elder, Columella, Pliny the Elder, Quintilian, or Petronius); (3) a few rare technical terms occurring in certain authors (not listed) of the first two centuries A.D. 'Practically all' Plautine words of reasonable authenticity have now been included, on the basis of Lindsay's text. The result is a dictionary of

high quality and of commendably wide scope for its size. Whether all the material presented seems properly balanced will depend upon one's definition of a 'pocket' dictionary. A small but good dictionary such as this can be a valuable reference work for many outside the ranks of classical students; on the other hand, it is dangerous to suggest that classical students should use a small dictionary, inevitably lacking in its text such educational assets as names of authors, references, and quotations, beyond a relatively early stage in their studies—not, surely, extending to the reading of the whole of Plautus. Concentration on purely literary vocabulary is not easily maintained—one need instance only the inclusion of such technical words as *fistuca* (but not, of course, *fistucare*) as well as *festucula*, or *alica* (but not, e.g., *fertum*), *mal-leolus* 'fire-dart' (but not hammer-shaped 'slip' for planting), *factor*—and exhaustive treatment of one or a few writers reduces appeal to the non-classicist, who may with Julian seek 'more attention to the sciences'. Reasonably so, perhaps, when we are trying to lower barriers, Handford would doubtless welcome such wider appeal, as he would, one hopes, disagree with the suggestion found in the preface to the *Greek-English Dictionary* that it may 'lend occasional service to more advanced students when they are unable or disinclined' [*sic*] to use a more extensive work. If one questions some of the principles which Handford has followed it is only because from what he has given us one realizes his ability, by slight reorientation, to satisfy much wider needs.

The few misprints include *shērē* for *hērēs* (p. 152, head) and duplication of the entry *buccula*. The special symbols shown on p. 20 seem to have been neglected in the text.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK
King's College, Newcastle upon Tyne,
University of Durham

CORRESPONDENCE

DR. PRETE writes:

In his review (*C. R.* 1956, pp. 128 ff.) of my edition of Terence, Dr. Skutsch offers what I consider to be unfair criticism. In his discussion of certain points, he betrays a lack of knowledge of current scholarship on Terentian problems. For the sake of brevity my remarks must be limited to parts of his

review, but I propose to publish in the near future a detailed reply to his objections. The nature of the subject lamentably makes it unavoidable that I speak of my own studies of Terence, but I would not have done that *si . . . non lacessisset prior*.

The first of my Terentian studies was an examination of the Bembo manuscript (Vat.

Lat. 3226). The results appear in the volume *Il codice Bembo di Terenzio*, Città del Vaticano, 1950 (Studi e Testi, 153). I approached and I believe I have solved the difficult problem of the correctors of the *Bembinus* (A) by a careful study of the scripts of the various hands and reached conclusions opposed to those of Umpfenbach, Hauler, and Kauer. What are we to say of the fact that Umpfenbach assigned the same kind of script to the 15th century, Hauler to the 9th, and Kauer to the 5th? Kauer in his enthusiasm for Iovialis, whom he discovered, went so far as to attribute to him corrections which in fact belong to different centuries (cf. *Il codice Bembo*, p. 37).¹ As for the content of the corrections in A, I have shown that some are independent of the Callipian *recensio* (ω). These conclusions shed new light on the history of the text of Terence, as I pointed out in my article in *S.I.F.C.*, n.s. xxv (1951), 111-34.² Skutsch seems to know nothing of publications which are the foundation of the introduction to my edition. He asks that my work be checked by an expert. For the convenience of those who wish to do so the most pertinent *folia* of A are reproduced in *Il codice Bembo*. There are, moreover, numerous reviews of my publications which might have supplied him with information.³

Instead of handling these fundamental issues he has confined his criticism to culling certain inaccuracies and misprints from my book and discussing them thoroughly. Even


¹ Kauer seems to have realized his mistake, for subsequently he distinguished between *Jov.* and *Jov'*. *Jov'*, however, does not appear in his edition. (Cf. J. F. Mountford, *The Scholia Bemina*, London, 1934, p. 118, n. 3.)

² The article was prepared at the request of the late Giorgio Pasquali who intended to include it in a revised edition of his *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*. He was unable, however, to revise his work and his second edition is merely a reprint of the first with some general chapters added at the end.

³ I quote two of the most important: A. Amatucci, *G.I.F.* lv (1951), 277-9 and A. Pratesi, *Doxa* iv (1951), 277-9. Perhaps Skutsch will be interested to know that Pratesi in his edition of Terence (Roma 1952) accepts completely the results of my research. He writes in his introduction: 'il testo della presente edizione si fonda in prevalenza sulla collazione dei manoscritti eseguita dall' Umpfenbach e dal Kauer. Non così per il Bembo, di cui una revisione totale era imposta dai risultati della recente indagine di Sesto Prete.'

so he is often superficial, misleading, and wrong. For example:

1. On p. 13 of the volume will be found the

famous sign  & ...

I have read this as *J* (<*ohannis*> *P* (<*andon*> *j* <*amicorum*>).⁴ Skutsch writes: 'the discovery of the alleged signature of Porcellius ... does not inspire much confidence'. My interpretation is based on the fact that it was the custom of owners of codices in the Renaissance to inscribe on the first folios of their manuscripts their own name, together with the phrase 'et amicum'⁵ and above all on the fact that the lines preceding the sign are *not* in Bembo's hand, as was pointed out not only by Hauler in 1889 but by Sabbadini in 1932; that the lines are those of Porcellius had been already suggested by the famous Gaetano Marini, primus custos of the Vatican Library in the time of Napoleon, as Dr. Skutsch might have learnt from my edition, p. 415.

2. Skutsch complains (p. 131) that I fail to note a fragment of the Bembo manuscript containing the initial portion of the last verses of *Andria*. I have discussed this fragment in an article 'Due frammenti Vaticani' (*Romance Philology*, 1955, pp. 260-3) and expressed my judgement on its value to the editor of Terence.

3. As for Skutsch's views on the Bononiensis (b), I once shared them myself, as he might have learned from my article 'Un nuovo codice di Terenzio' (*Rendic. Accad. Sc. Bologna, Sc. Mor.* Ser. v, iii, 1949-50, pp. 208-29). In consequence of a complete collation of the manuscript, however, I changed my opinion, and for a good reason. Many readings proper to A are found also in Bononiensis (b) together with a number of excellent conjectures later proposed by famous humanists. This latter is not unusual in manuscripts of the 14th century, but in (b) the number of such instances is extraordinary. For example:

⁴ In *Il codice Bembo* (p. 13, n. 2) I noted (without realizing that Sabbadini had already done so) that it was possible that the sign indicates the price of the manuscript. In my edition of Terence I quote Sabbadini (*Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli xiv e xv*, Firenze, 1904, i. 146, n. 33): 'nella sigla L 14 et ... che segue, io vedrei significato il prezzo di acquisto: Libris 14, con la cifra dei soldi cancellata.' Skutsch suggests this interpretation and adds 'if I am not mistaken' as if he were proposing something new, instead of reproducing a solution rejected in my footnote.

⁵ G. D. Hobson, 'Et amicum', *The Library*, iv (1949), 87-99.

Eun. 268 nimirum homines Ab (nimum h. cett.); 370 tu om. Ab; 377 duc om. Ab; 384 despectam Ab, schol. D (despicatam cett.); 402 gestare ACb (gestire cett.); 454 voce visa sum modo Ab (vi. sum vo. mo. DGL, vi. sum mo. vo. EF); 460 non moror ADb (num mo. cett.); 513 fecisse se codd. (praet. Ab, om. se). I quote some more instances, taken at random: Heaut. 779 spondeo Ab (despondeo cett.); *Eun.* 67 mehercule Ab (hercule cett.); *Phorm.* 98 ancillulam Ab (aniculam cett.); only Ab indicate a new scene after *Hec.* 815, and in *Eun.* 644 Ab alone give the correct distribution of roles.

4. Skutsch objects to the designation of the second corrector of the *Riccardianus* as E² instead of E* or (E). E* would be misleading because D* is used to indicate the hand, a different hand, supplying the *periocha* in D. Skutsch realizes that the situation in E is not the same as in D but insists that 'he (Prete) ought to have given an explanation'. The explanation is given on p. 56, where the corrector *receis* is identified as E². The symbol recommended by Skutsch and used by Umpfenbach would also be misleading, for to indicate the hand supplying the *periocha* as E* or (E) and the corrector as E² would give the impression that these symbols refer to different persons, whereas they are in fact the same. Instead of limiting his remarks to the 'slightly misleading symbol E²' he might have informed his readers about my collation of E which has yielded a considerable amount of new and, I hope, interesting information, as the apparatus testifies. E is, to my knowledge, the only manuscript which indicates the division into acts (cf. *Gnomon*, xxvii [1955], 93).

5. Skutsch asserts (p. 132) that my apparatus is compiled from those of Kauer and Marouzeau. Evidently he does not know my review of Marouzeau (*G.I.F.* ii [1949], 276-80). It would seem, however, that his own review is based solely on Kauer and Marouzeau. My apparatus for A, G, E, and b is based exclusively on personal research; I have also collated at first hand¹ much of D, C, and F as well as other manuscripts of Paris and Vienna by microfilm.

Some of Skutsch's objections to details are without foundation. Thus, at *And.* 927, I note the line division of the manuscripts. Skutsch

finds this surprising and asks 'by what divine afflatus either of these scholars [= Kauer, Mar., and P.] knows the line division of those manuscripts that have no line division'. Skutsch must know that A indicates the line division throughout; D, P, and F do so sometimes, to mention only the principal codices. It is not too much to assume then, that when mention of line division appears in the apparatus the reader will understand that reference is made only to those manuscripts which have it. On p. 131 Skutsch twice observes that where I have ascribed a reading to the editors (*edit.*) these readings are not those of Bentley. 'It is nowhere stated', he writes, 'that *edit.* means editors of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries' and, shortly below, 'the sentence *edit.* . . . *mutant* is wholly redundant and misleading as well since *edit.* in the apparatus means, or ought to mean, all editors'. Now in the 16th century alone there were 193 editions of Terence, 40 in the 15th, 104 in the 17th, and 58 in the period between 1700 and 1799.² Does Skutsch seriously propose that modern editors collate these 395 editions?

7. I do not agree with Skutsch that the collation of v.b. or b.c. is useless. It was long thought by scholars (cf. edition p. 416) that b.c. was the *Bembinus*. In my earlier publications I made no mention of this manuscript and this omission was criticized by certain scholars (cf. *Doxa*, iv [1951], 84). It was in answer to these criticisms that I offered the collation of b.c. Skutsch would not have considered this 'foolish' if he were acquainted with the problems involved. Nor do I agree that the identification of v.c. with the *Basili-canus* (B) is 'manifestly wrong'. I collated B in part³ and concluded that its readings are the same as those designated as v.c. in the edition of B. Filologo.

8. Admittedly there are misprints in my edition; the printing of a new critical apparatus presents many difficulties to a publisher who was doing his first work of this type. Some of the errors are obvious. Skutsch, I think, has devoted a disproportionate space to them. Thus at *Andria* 927 my apparatus

² I have taken these facts from the Bipontine edition of Terence (*Publii Terenti Afri comoediae sex . . . studiis Societatis Bipontensis*, Biponti, 1, xi-xxvii); cf. L. W. Jones and C. R. Morey, *The Miniatures of the Manuscripts of Terence prior to the 13th Century*, Princeton, 1930-1, ii. 4.

³ It was not easy to find it in the Vatican Library, since the editors, obviously working at second hand, refer to it as H 79. The correct signature is H 19.

¹ Since it has escaped Skutsch's attention I note here that in a miniature in C (f. 54^v) I discovered, written in a very thin 14th-century script, the words 'vivo burgongne' which the late Prof. C. R. Morey considered very important for the history of the manuscript.

reads: is in *fine huius uersus habent codd.* (om. GV) *editt.*; *init. uersus* 927 *pon.* Linds. K. Mar. Clearly, 927 should read 928. Skutsch complains that the impression is given that b is independent of the other Calliopian manuscripts and selects two places in which b appears in the apparatus to be isolated when, in fact, it agrees with the other manuscripts of the Calliopian family. In citing these errors he might have noted that in the apparatus to *Andria* 762 there is a lacuna before b (the letter δ has been omitted). In view of what I have said, Skutsch's tone is hard to justify. It seems to betray a subjective attitude that is scarcely in keeping with the objectivity required of serious scholarship.

PROFESSOR SKUTSCH replies:

It will not do for Dr. Prete to lay the blame for his misprints, a small portion of the errors censured by me, at the door of his publishers. Knowing that they were inexperienced in this sort of work he ought to have read his proofs better.

Having shown that Dr. Prete's knowledge of Latin and of metre was totally inadequate to the task of editing Terence I proceeded to prove that his edition was lamentably inaccurate. The same inaccuracy is shown in his reply. Not with one word did I mention, either on p. 321 or elsewhere, the fragments of the Bembinus which he has since discussed in the *Journal of Romance Philology*. Nor did I call his collations of b.c. and v.c. 'foolish'. What I said was: 'If anyone should ever be so foolish as to collate hundreds of manuscripts of Terence in an attempt to get some order into the late transmission'. The difference, however, may not be obvious to somebody who does not distinguish between Bentley's and 394 other editions. The Librarian of the London Institute of Classical Studies says in connexion with the identification of v.c. with the Basilicanus, which I called 'manifestly wrong': 'I have checked the ten readings of v.c. given by Dr. Prete on p. 318, against a microfilm of the Basilicanus; three tally with the manuscript, seven do not'. I do not propose to argue other points with Dr. Prete and leave it confidently to future reviewers to confirm the charges which I have made; in the meantime compare E. Fraenkel, *S.I.F.C.* xxvii/xxviii (1956), 123 n. 2. But I am grateful to Dr. Prete for enabling me to correct a false impression concerning the alleged signature of Porcellius. L. 14 is the obvious interpretation. My remark 'if I am not mistaken' was, as the editors of this journal know, substituted in the proof for 'as plain as a pikestaff'. In trying to find an expression of equal length,

at once more cautious and more polite, I overlooked that I might seem to be claiming for myself the solution which Dr. Prete in that very passage endeavours to replace.

PROFESSOR PAGE writes:

(I) Professor Davison tells us (*C. R.* n.s. vi [1956], 207) that he had to 'repress a shudder of repugnance' at the announcement of two more books on the *Odyssey*: which he nevertheless steeled himself to read and review; in what spirit, we can imagine; with what result, we shall see.

I spend no time over his exaggerations ('Professor Page is *almost always* polemical'); or his complacency (it is not for Professor Davison to inform me that my 'reputation as a scholar' is my 'own affair'); or his indignation *in vacuo* (I am 'at times unbecomingly rude to eminent scholars': this is false; or perhaps he will quote some examples verbatim, remembering that the standard of unbecoming rudeness is set by his 'academic troglodytes', 'numskulls', 'grubbing about', 'climbing on the Homeric band-wagon', and other such phrases in his few pages). These may be thought trivial matters: not so the following misrepresentations:

(1) Professor Davison asserts that I have set myself 'to answer a question which no longer has any real meaning, namely whether the *Odyssey* was composed by a single author or by a number of authors'; this is an 'obsolete conception', and 'the rest of us . . . have already assimilated the idea of an evolutionary "Homer"'. An author has the right to demand that a reviewer shall read his book less inattentively. What the analysis of the poem was designed to prove is that the *Odyssey*, in its present form, owes its coherence at certain points not to the poetical tradition but to a summary (and rather perfunctory) editorial process, acting on the 'evolutionary' material. The importance of the fact, if it is one, needs no stressing: the point was obvious to my listeners at the time, and has specially attracted the attention of readers, whether convinced or unconvinced. But I have evidently not made the point clear enough for Professor Davison to notice it: he actually thinks that I am trying to discover whether the *Odyssey* was composed by a single author 'in the sense in which Thackeray was the author of *The Newcomes*'.

(2) The error in the final paragraph of the review has already been noticed by others: 'Professor Page makes a great deal of play with the Pisistratean recension of the Homeric poems'—he does not; his reviewer has confused two very different things: (1) the evid-

ence (external, of course) for a 'Pisistratean recension', which I did not discuss, referring the reader to Merkelbach's admirable treatment of it; (2) the evidence (internal, of course) for a standard Athenian edition, dating from the sixth century or a little earlier, as established in infinite detail by Wackernagel's *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*; that is what I was talking about, and nobody familiar with those topics can say that I have not made it plain enough. Professor Davison refers us to his article in *T.A.P.A.*, where the confusion is exhibited at full stretch. There he shows that he is unfamiliar with Wackernagel's great book, for he does not so much as mention it, and he makes a few remarks about Attic forms in Homer which he would not have made if he had read it. The 'Pisistratean recension' is a distinct and quite secondary problem: it is Wackernagel's work which justifies the claim of Caer and Carpenter, that if there were no tradition about an Athenian edition we should be compelled by the internal evidence to invent one. To confuse these two matters is to display a fundamental misapprehension of one of the most important points in Homeric criticism.

(II) When Professor Davison does no more than misrepresent the entire contents of a book, nobody cares any longer. When he ends his review of my *Sappho and Alcaeus* by alleging that 'downright inaccuracies' are to be found in it, it is proper that downright falsehoods should be exposed. Three examples are given: (1) *Ἀφροδίτη* instead of *Χάρις*, an unimportant slip (and it required a great deal of ill will to call it anything else). (2)

'The misquotation of *P. Oxy.* 2294 at the top of p. 117': I hereby inform your readers that the quotation is absolutely correct. (3) 'The extraordinary slip by which *mollis* is taken with *flamma* at *Aen.* iv. 66, quoted on p. 29, n. 2': if the reader will turn to p. 29, n. 2, he will not find anything about *mollis* being taken with *flamma*; he will find the accurate statement that '*est mollis flamma medullas* has something in common with Sappho's *λεπρὸν πῖπ'*', and he would be right if he judged that this was the careful phrasing of one who knows (as Professor Davison apparently does not) that since remote antiquity it has been a matter for debate whether *mollis* agrees with *flamma* or with *medullas*.

In the light of these exposures, your readers will know what to think of anything else this reviewer may say.

PROFESSOR DAVISON replies with reference to (I):

Although I am very sorry that my review of *The Homeric Odyssey* has caused Professor Page so much distress, I cannot honestly say that I feel at all guilty. Anyone who compares what I actually wrote with Professor Page's version of it will see at once that almost all his grievances are figments of his own imagination; for the rest, I am well content that your readers should judge for themselves whether anything that I have written about Professor's Page's work exceeds, or even approaches, the severity of his own comments on the work of scholars with whom he disagrees (e.g. Professor Karl Reinhardt, *The Homeric Odyssey*, near the top of page 48).

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

TRANSACTIONS OF THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

LXXXVI (1955)

J. A. Davison, *Peisistratus and Homer*: a thorough-going consideration of the evidence does not support the allegation that the text of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was first put together and reduced to writing in sixth-century Athens, but rather suggests that the version

which was adopted as the standard text for the Panathenaea was already in writing when imported for that purpose. D. W. Bradeen, *The Trittyes in Cleisthenes' Reforms*: the general purpose was to integrate the Eupatridae into the democracy by devising a system by which, since most of them belonged to city demes, they could have the maximum chance of serving as Prytaneis and also in the military organization. L.

Woodbury, *The Tongue and the Whetstone*: discussion of Pindar, *Ol.* vi. 82-83. J. A. O. Larsen, *The Boeotian Confederacy and Fifth-Century Oligarchic Theory*: a study of this form of government from 447 B.C. onwards sheds light on the distinction, as then current, between oligarchy and democracy; it also points to some interchange of political ideas between the oligarchic and democratic parties in Boeotian cities with their opposite numbers in Athens. H. W. Miller, *Techne and Discovery in On Ancient Medicine*: the author's view of *techne* stressed the processes of investigation and discovery, and envisaged the possibility of progress in knowledge of nature and accuracy of treatment, granted ability on the part of the physician and the use of a method different from that of 'hypotheses'. M. H. Jameson, *Seniority in the Strategia*: considers the problem of the doubling of tribal representation in favour of Pericles and Alcibiades, and decides in favour of Beloch's hypothesis of a regular, annual chairman of the *strategoi*, elected from all the people but enjoying no special authority. W. D. Anderson, *The Importance of Damonian Theory in Plato's Thought*: Damon's main beliefs appear nowhere in the dialogues, and Plato's most striking speculations in the musical sphere owe little or nothing to Damon. M. Ostwald, *The Athenian Legislation against Tyranny and Subversion*: an historical treatment of the evidence from pre-Solonian times to c. 330 B.C. W. H. Willis, *A New Papyrus of Aeschines*: a fragment photographed and edited. P. W. Harsh, *The Intriguing Slave in Greek Comedy*: refutes the assumption that the deceptive slave is mainly a Roman creation. W. Allen, *The British Epics of Quintus and Marcus Cicero*: re-examination of the evidence regarding these two eulogies of Caesar's campaigns. A. K. Michels, *Death and Two Poets*: Lucretius and Propertius on this theme. L. A. MacKay, *Three Levels of Meaning in Aeneid vi*: these are the spiritual enlightenment of Aeneas, the symbolizing of the moral progress experienced by all virtuous men, and the representation of a successful effort to understand the nature and destiny of man. R. S. Rogers, *Heirs and Rivals to Nero*: seeks an explanation of Nero's delay in dealing with several of his potential rivals. H. W. Traub, *Pliny's Treatment of History in Epistolary Form*: in the letters containing historical narratives Pliny deliberately enters into friendly rivalry with Tacitus. S. E. Stout, *The Basis of the Text in Book X of Pliny's Letters*: the history of the text of the Pliny-Trajan correspondence is important for establishing correct readings. S. E. Stout, *The Coalescence of the Two Plinys*: for

some three centuries after his death Pliny's Letters were not in general circulation, and his identity was merged in that of his uncle. C. Henderson, *Cato's Pine Cones and Seneca's Plums*: *Fronto* p. 149 vdH: a note on the sharp contrast in this passage between the austerity of Cato's style and the preciosity of Seneca's. A. Diller, *The Authors named Pausanias*: discusses the possible relations of the author of the *Periegesis* to his homonyms of the second century A.D. R. Pack, *Artemidorus and His Waking World*: the *Onirocritica* gives some information regarding the author's background, travels, opinions, and acquaintances. G. Downey, *Education and Public Problems as seen by Themistius*: on T.'s advocacy of a classical and pagan culture. A. C. Andrews, *Greek and Latin Terms for Salmon and Trout*: reduces such information as exists to conformity with modern classifications. B. S. J. Isserlin, *The Isis and Her Voyage: Some Additional Remarks*: medieval evidence would suggest modification of the conclusions of L. Casson, *T.A.P.A.* lxxi. 43. C. A. Forbes, *The Education and Training of Slaves in Antiquity* (supplementary paper): little is known of the processes of servile education; apprenticeship (leading to manual trades, music, medicine, shorthand), the Roman *paedagogia*, and other less formal methods are discussed.

MNEMOSYNE

4th SERIES, IX (1956), FASC. 3

J. H. Croon, *Artemis Thermia and Apollo Thermios*: gives a survey of the cults of these deities near hot springs; Artemis is the most popular after Heracles (cf. the writer's *The Herdsman of the Dead*); the worship of Apollo in this connexion seems to have spread from Asia Minor; at Thermon in Aetolia Apollo Thermios may have been named after hot springs, since remains of a fire-cult were found under his temple, and on Oeta there was a fire-cult of Heracles in a region full of hot springs sacred to H. B. A. van Groningen, *Trois notes sur Empédocle*: (1) fr. 27, l. 2, retain γένος; cf. Hes. *Theog.* 161; (2) fr. 123, l. 2, for Μεριστώ read *Μελισσώ; (3) fr. 137, ll. 2-3, the text is sound, of δ' ἀπορεῦνται meaning 'the assistants know not what they are doing'. W. J. W. Koster, *De codice Aristophaneo Matritensi 4683*: the older part of this manuscript is thirteenth century, and contains *Plut.* 1-528, *Clouds*, *Frogs* 1-686; Constantine Lascaris in 1490 supplied *Lives*, *Plut.* 529-end, *Frogs* 687-end; to this was added ll. 1-308 of the *Knights*, which is not one of this Byzantine triad. M. van Straaten,

Panaetius frgm. 86: P.'s classification of the procreative power of man as a function not of the *ψυχή* but of the *φύσις* is perhaps a conscious borrowing from Aristotle. W. B. Sedgwick, *Conjectures on Cicero, ad Atticum*: on i. 14. 1 (transp.), ii. 21. 4, iii. 14. 2 [anticipated by Manutius], iv. 7. 2 [not 6. 2], 13. 1, 17. 2, 18. 4, v. 2. 2, 16. 2 (comic fragment?), 20. 2 (gloss), vi. 2. 3 [but *tum de is* Klotz's conjecture, *de deo cum M*], vii. 1. 4 (Enn. *Medea*?), 1. 5 (Atellane fragment?), 7. 7, 18. 2, viii. 3. 7, 6. 4, 16. 2 (*bis*), ix. 8. 1, 10. 6, 11. 3, 11a. 3, 13. 3, 13. 4, 15. 3, 15. 5, x. 1. 2, 7. 1, 8. 4, 12a. 4, 13. 3, 18. 1, xi. 2. 2, 12. 1, 17a. 1, 20. 2, 23. 3, xii. 5. 1, 7. 1 [part of this note refers to 5. 1], xiii. 10. 3, 16. 1, 17. 1, 20. 4, 23. 3 (a senarius?), 25. 3, xiv. 5. 2, 16. 4, xv. 1. 4, 2. 2, 13. 3 (*bis*), 13. 4, 16a, 29. 1 (*bis*), xvi. 15. 3. J. H. Waszink, *Manilianae*: at i. 283 Housman wrongly dismisses du Fay's interpretation of *binas Arctos*, and in 284 *conspicit* can be defended; at i. 311 W. defends *hinc uicina poli caelique hinc* (GL); Housman's extra verse 316a is unnecessary, since *similis = similiter* (cf. *Aen.* xii. 477); at i. 336 the sense is 'semper erit bellum, quia paribus viribus aequi sunt'; at i. 355 in *poenas signata suas* means 'signum facta, ut impietatis iustas poenas daret'. J. H. Jongkees, *Aristophanes, Lysistrata 722, and the Erechtheum*: the pulley on the Acropolis from which a woman wriggled down may be associated with a crane on the then unfinished Erechtheum. W. J. Verdenius, *Two Notes on the Epitrepotes*: in fr. 1 (K.) *καὶ* is adversative; in l. 9 *οἰκῆτης* = 'house-mate'. Id., *Emphatic Use of the Participle*: interpretations of Callinus fr. 1.5 and Xenophanes fr. 2. 10-11. D. Kuijper, *Ad Sen. Cons. Helo. 12.2*: would read *transeamus a perspecto nobis: veniamus ad locupletes*.

4th SERIES IX (1956), FASC. 4

D. Cohen, *I.G. I² 86 and Thucydides V 47*: suggests a new restoration of this inscription recording the treaty 420/19 B.C. between Athens, Argos, Mantinea, and Elis, of which T. has also recorded the conditions. J. H. Loenen, *Albinus' Metaphysics*: counters R. E. Witt's view that A.'s Platonism is full of contradictions; it is not true that A. interprets the *Timaeus* literally; he is an independent interpreter of Plato, original because he consistently combines three notions: (a) the independent eternal existence of matter and world-soul, (b) the extra-temporal generation of the cosmos as such by God, (c) the concept of the final character of God's causality. C. W. Whitaker, *Lucan and the Loire*: at i. 432, for *qua Cinga* (Bentley *Sulga*,

since the Cinga was in Spain) *pererrat*, conjectures *qua Liger oberrat*, defending the scansion. J. Colin, *Le mariage de Vestustilla et le dieu Acorus*: in Mart. iii. 93. 24, *sternatur Acori de (acorde Py) triclino lectus*, A. is a *daimon* or *genius infernus*, cf. *C.I.L.* xii. 5783, 5798, and the allusion is to a mystic marriage. B. A. van Groningen, *Un oracle de Delphes*: in the oracle quoted in Hdt. iv. 159 *ἵστέρον . . . γὰς ἀναδαιομένης* contains an intentional ambiguity. W. J. W. Koster, *Pseudo-Andronicus de variis poetarum generibus*: the author of the *περὶ τάξεως ποιητῶν* (cod. Par. 2929) must be Palaecoppa. H. Wagenvoort, *Ad Serv. Dan. Aen. 2, 35*: for *Capuae iuvencae* read *tabulae Capuae inventae*, cf. Suet. *Caes.* 81. D. Holwerda, *Ad Aesch. Agam. 374-5*: conjectures *πέφανται δ' ἐννοῦσα* | *ἀτολμήσαν* *Ἀπό.* L. H. Lucassen, *A propos de Clément d'Alexandrie, Strom. ii 16, 1-4*: for *ἀθέως* read *ἀθώως*. A. Garzya, *Rutilii Cl. Namatiani i. 98 emendatur*: emends *qua vix imbriferas tollerit Iris aquas* to *qua vix Iris aquas tollerit imbrifera*. J. C. Kamerbeek, *Ἀρεμυς ἐνέκοος*: the adj. means 'good at hearing', not 'goddess of healing' (*Mnem.* iv. 9, 197 n. 3).

REVUE DE PHILOGOLOGIE

XXX. 2 (1956)

M. Lejeune, *Essais de philologie mycénienne*, (iii) *Nouveaux inventaires de roues (Pylos)*: examines the texts of the *Sa*-series and suggests interpretations. A. Ernout, *Les Gynaecia de Caelius Aurelianus*: corrections in the text, first published by M. F. and I. E. Drabkin in 1951, and observations on the vocabulary and style of the work. F. Thomas, *Du latin faxō / faxim, legam, -as, etc. à l'injonctif*: the double use, modal and temporal, of *-s* in *faxo*, *faxim* and in *dixi*, and of *-ā* in *legam*, *-as* and in *legebam* suggests revival of the old theory of a prehistoric 'injunctive' in which past experience is placed on the same modal level with possibility, will, etc., as contrasted with present fact. G. Méautis, *Pindarica*: interpretations of *P.* 10. 25-55, *P.* 12, *N.* 2. 12-14. C. Mugler, *L'isonomie des atomistes*: distinguishes the 'ontological' *ἰσονομία* of the atomists from the 'distributive' *ἰσονομία* of Plato and discusses the combination of the notions in Epicurus. V. Coulon, *Varia Coniectanea*: Ar. *Birds* 357, revives Reiske's *λαμβάνοντε τὴν χύτραν*; *Knights* 1379, proposes *σαφέστατα κρουστικός*; *Plut.* 979 justifies Porson's *πάντ' ἂν ἀνθυπηρέτου*; *Thesm.* 857 reads *μελανοσυρμαίω λεῶ*. Long reviews of Martin's *Lucretius* (Ernout), Lobel and Page's *Poetarum, Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, and Page's *Sappho and Alcaeus* (Chantraine).

RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

XCIX. 2 (1956)

R. Merkelbach, *βουκολιστοί* (*Der Wettgesang der Hirten*); from comparison of German, Italian, and Kirghiz folk-song, formulates the rules for amoebean song. These are observed in Theocritus with the exception of id. 8, which therefore cannot be genuine. Its author, Bion, and Moschus drew their inspiration from Theocritus; T. drew his direct from folk-poetry and so created a new literary form. G. Giangrande, *Vermutungen und Bemerkungen zum Text der Vitae Sophistarum des Eunapios*: critical notes on 25 passages. E. Sander, *Die Quellen des Buches iv. 31-46 der Epitome des Vegetius*: for cc. 31-36, 43, 45, Vegetius used

Celsus; for 38-42, Celsus or perhaps Pater-nus (from Varro) along with Frontinus; for 37, 44, 46, a fourth-century author. R. Stark, *Bemerkungen zu zwei Alkaios-Fragmenten*: Diehl (1952³) fr. adesp. 25 is Lesbian lyric to be attributed (probably) to Alcaeus: l. 3 of Alcaeus fr. 94 Diehl (= fr. 347 (Z 23) Lobel-Page) should be attributed to Sappho. A. Capelle, *Platonisches im größeren Hippas*: argues that the dialogue is genuine. W. Kranz, *Theoria Vita*: notes the use of *theoria* (for *theoretica*) *vita* from the ninth to the thirteenth century. P. Maas, *Argivische Hiebe*: adds to the *Fragmenta iambica adespota* in *Anth. Lyr. Gr.* (Diehl 1952, fasc. 3) ἴσασιν Ἀργείων γὰρ οἱ πεπληγμένοι, quoted by Olympiodorus on Plato, *Alc. Maior* 117A δέδοικα κτλ.

NOTES AND NEWS

THE third International Congress of Greek and Latin Epigraphy will be held in Rome on 4-8 September 1957. Information may be obtained from the Secretary of the Organizing Committee of the Congress, Città Universitaria, Rome. The Congress of Archaeology has been postponed to 1958.

The latest number of *Historia* (Band vi, Heft 1, January 1957) is an 'Etrusker-Heft'. An introduction by M. Pallottino is followed by articles by G. Säfslund (*Über den Ursprung der Etrusker*), G. Devoto (*Gli Etruschi nel quadro dei popoli italici antichi*), K. Olzscha (*Schrift und Sprache der Etrusker*), R. Bloch (*L'art étrusque et son arrière-plan historique*), J. Heurgon (*L'état étrusque*), S. Mazzarino (*Sociologia del mondo etrusco e problemi della tarda etruscità*), and R. Hertsig (*Zur Religion und Religiosität der Etrusker*). The number is published by Franz Steiner Verlag of Wiesbaden and is separately priced at DM. 12.

A new half-volume of Pauly-Wissowa, xxiii. 1 (Stuttgart: Druckenmüller) extends from Priscilla to Psalychiadae. By far the largest share is occupied by Procopius of Caesarea (B. Rubin) with over 160 pages. Other major articles are on Protagoras (K. von Fritz), Proclus (R. Bentler: 32 pp.), Procopius of Gaza (W. Aly), Probus, Propertius, Prudentius, and Prosper (R. Helm); Psalms (A. Weiser); Procne (G. Radke), Prometheus (W. Krans-L. Eckhart), Proteus (H. Herter); Prusias (C. Habicht); *προβούλευμα* (H. Schaefer), *προίξ* (H. J. Wolff), and *privilegium* (G. Wesenberg). There are supplementary articles on *προσκήνιον*, *procurator*, *provincia*, and *prodigus*.

The authentic text of Chapman's Homer—the *Iliads*, the *Odysseys*, and *The Crowne of Homers Workes* (as he called the *Batrachomyomachia* and the *Hymns*)—has reappeared, in two handsome volumes, under the editorship of Professor Allardyce Nicoll, who has added an apparatus of introductions, textual notes,

commentary, and glossary. The edition is designed 'for the general reader and for the student engaged in exploring the literature of the Elizabethan period'; it is published by Pantheon Books, of New York, in the Bollingen Series.

We draw attention to some useful American reprints of books which have long been out of print—Gilbert Murray's *Ancient Greek Literature* and Tenney Frank's Sather Lectures, *Life and Literature in the Roman Republic*, are published by the University of Chicago Press and distributed in this country by the Cambridge Press (15s. and 13s. 6d.). Franz Cumont's *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* and his *Mysteries of Mithra*, both in the original English translations, are issued by Dover Publications, Inc., of New York (\$1.75 and \$1.85). Unlike some cheap reprints, all these are properly sewn in signatures and provided with ample margins to allow rebinding in cloth. Another welcome reprint is Westcott and Hort's New Testament (Macmillan); improbable as it may seem in these days, a book of more than 600 pages (539 of them in Greek type), bound in dark blue cloth with gilt lettering, is priced at 10s. 6d.

LIDDELL & SCOTT

We have been asked to make the following announcement on behalf of the Delegates of the Oxford University Press:

Work on a Supplement to the 9th Edition is actively in progress under the joint editorship of Professor P. Maas and Mr. E. A. Barber. Its purpose is to cover work on papyri and inscriptions published since 1940 and to a certain extent new critical editions of and commentaries on classical authors. It is also hoped that some deficiencies in the treatment of classical literature in earlier editions may be made good, within the limits that a Supplement, as distinct from a Revised Edition, allows.

A large amount of valuable material has already been accumulated, most of it thanks to the help of experts in various fields. The editors would welcome further assistance and will be obliged if any scholar who is prepared to submit either corrigenda or additional material in any particular field would get in touch with Mr. Barber, who in the latter case will inform him of what is already available and of the form in which further contributions should be submitted.

Correspondence should be addressed to Mr. Barber at Room 314, New Bodleian Library, Oxford.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included in this list unless they are also published separately.

Avenarius (G.) Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung. Pp. 184. Meisenheim (Glan): Anton Hain, 1956. Paper, DM.14.50.

Blumenkranz (B.) Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et Christiani. (Stromata, iii.)

Pp. 83. Utrecht: Het Spectrum, 1956. Paper, fl. 4.25.

Bonnard (A.) Greek Civilization from the Iliad to the Parthenon. Translated by A. L. Sells. Pp. 199; 32 plates. London: Allen & Unwin, 1957. Cloth, 30s. net.

- Bueno** (D. R.) *Homero: La Iliada. Estudio preliminar y versión rítmica. Tomo iii* (xvii-xxiv). Pp. 285. Madrid: Hernando, 1956. Paper, 40 ptas.
- Buffière** (F.) *Les mythes d'Homère et la pensée grecque*. Pp. 677. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper.
- Buttrey** (T. V.) *The Triumviral Portrait Gold of the Quattorviri Monetales of 42 B.C. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 137.)* Pp. 69; 9 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$ 2.
- Caley** (E. R.) and **Richards** (J. F. C.) *Theophrastus on Stones. A modern edition with Greek text, translation, introduction and commentary*. Pp. 238. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University, 1956. Cloth, \$ 6.
- Crahay** (R.) *La littérature oraculaire chez Hérodote. (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l' Univ. de Liège, fasc. cxxxviii.)* Pp. xxxi+368. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper, 1,000 fr.
- Cumont** (F.) *The Mysteries of Mithra. Pp. xiv+239; 50 figs. [Reprint of the English translation of the second French edition.]* New York: Dover Publications, 1956. Stiff paper, \$ 1.85.
- Cumont** (F.) *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. Pp. xxiv+298. [Reprint of the English translation of 1911.]* New York: Dover Publications, 1956. Stiff paper, \$1.75.
- Dubs** (H. H.) *A Roman City in Ancient China. Pp. 48. London: The China Society, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.*
- Durant** (G. M.) *Journey into Roman Britain. Pp. viii+264; 16 plates. London: Bell, 1957. Cloth, 20s. net.*
- Ferguson** (J.) *Pelagius. A historical and theological study. Pp. 206. Cambridge: Heffer, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.*
- Denniston** (J. D.) and **Page** (D. L.) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon. Pp. xxxix+240. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 21s. net.*
- Dumbarton Oaks Papers. Numbers 9 and 10. Pp. ix+316; 59 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. (London: Oxford University Press), 1956. Cloth, 80s. net.*
- Fitzgerald** (R.) *Sophocles: Oedipus at Colonus. An English version. Pp. 101. London: Faber, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.*
- Gelzer** (M.) *Über die Arbeitsweise des Polybios. (Sitz. d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., 1956. 3.)* Pp. 36. Heidelberg: Winter, 1956. Paper, DM. 6.
- Greiffenhagen** (A.) *Griechische Eroten. Pp. 89; 54 figs. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1957. Cloth, DM. 14.*
- Hellenika: Φιλολογικόν, 'Ιστορικόν και Λαογραφικόν Περιοδικόν Σύγγραμμα. Τομὸς 14, τεύχος 2. Salonika: 'Εταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, 1956. Paper, δρ. 50; annual foreign subscription (2 parts), £1. 10s.**
- Henriksson** (K. E.) *Griechische Büchertitel in der römischen Literatur. (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, ser. B, tom. 102. 1.)* Pp. 200. Helsinki: Finnish Academy, 1956. Paper, 750 mk.
- Hommel** (H.) *Schöpfer und Erhalter: Studien zum Problem Christentum und Antike. Pp. 159. Berlin: Lettner Verlag, 1956. Cloth, DM. 6.80.*
- Hussey** (J. M.) *The Byzantine World. (Hutchinson's University Library.)* Pp. 191. London: Hutchinson, 1957. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Janssens** (E.) *Agamemnon: texte d'Aeschyle commenté. Pp. 169. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1955. Paper, 69 B. fr.*
- Janssens** (E.) *Sophocle: Oedipe Roi. Explications grammaticales, vocabulaire. Pp. 69. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1956. Paper, 23 B. fr.*
- Jones** (W. H. S.) *Pliny: Natural History. With an English translation. In 10 vols. Vol. vii (Books xxiv-xxvii). (Loeb Classical Library.)* Pp. xiv+558. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Koch** (H.) *Von ionischer Baukunst. Pp. 23; 16 plates. Cologne: Böhlau, 1956. Paper, DM. 4.80.*
- Kraeling** (C. H.) *Excavations at Dura-Europos: Final Report, VIII. Part i: The Synagogue. Pp. xvi+402; 78 plates, 124 figs., 12 plans. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 120s. net.*
- Lejeune** (A.) *L'Optique de Claude Ptolémée dans la version latine d'après l'arabe de l'émir Eugène de Sicile. Édition critique et exégétique. (Univ. de Louvain: Recueil de Trav. d'Hist. et de Philologie, 4e sér., fasc. 8.)* Pp. cxxxi+358. Louvain: Éditions Nauwelaerts, 1956. Paper, 420 B. fr.
- Lindemann** (H.), **Färber** (H.) *Griechische Grammatik. ii Teil: Satzlehre, Dialektgrammatik und Metrik. Pp. xii+172. Munich: Bayerischen Schulbuch-Verlag, 1957. Half-cloth, DM. 6.80.*
- Louis** (P.) *Aristote: Les Parties des Animaux. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.)* Pp. xl+194 (double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1957. Paper.
- McCracken** (G. E.) *Saint Augustine: The City of God. With an English translation. In 7 vols. Vol. i (Books i-iii). (Loeb Classical Library.)* Pp. lxxxix+399. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

- MacKenna* (S.), *Page* (B. S.) *Plotinus: The Enneads*. Translated by S. M. Second edition revised by B. S. P. Preface by E. R. Dodds; introduction by P. Henry. Pp. li+635. London: Faber, 1957. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Mascialino* (L.) *Licofrón: Alejandra*. Texto revisado y traducido. (Colección Hispánica de Autores Griegos y Latinos.) Pp. liv+88. Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1956. Cloth.
- Nicoll* (A.) *Chapman's Homer*. Edited with Introductions, Textual Notes, Commentaries and Glossaries. Vol. i: *The Iliad*. Vol. ii: *The Odyssey and the Lesser Homerica*. (Bollingen Series, xli.) Pp. xxii+740; xvi+654. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956. Cloth, \$ 10.
- Noe* (S. P.) *Two Hoards of Persian Siglois*. (Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 136.) Pp. 45; 15 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1956. Paper, \$2.
- Parke* (H. W.) and *Wormell* (D. E. W.) *The Delphic Oracle*. Vol. i: *The History*. Pp. x+436. Vol. ii: *The Oracular Responses*. Pp. xxxvi+271. Oxford: Blackwell, 1956. Cloth, 84s. net.
- Pesce* (G.) *Sarcofagi Romani di Sardegna*. Pp. 135; 114 plates. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1957. Paper, L. 10,000.
- Philippson* (A.) *Die griechischen Landschaften*. Band ii, Teil 1: *Epiros und der Pindos*. Pp. 290; 2 maps. Frankfurt-am-Main: Klostermann, 1956. Paper, DM. 28.50.
- Pöschl* (V.) *Horaz und die Politik*. (Sitz. d. Heid. Akad. d. Wiss., philos.-hist. Kl., 1956-4.) Pp. 29. Heidelberg: Winter, 1956. Paper, DM. 5.80.
- Prato* (C.) *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. A. Seneca*. Introduzione, testo critico, commento. Pp. 121. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1955. Paper.
- Rayner* (L.) *Women in a Village*. Pp. viii+247. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Ruelens* (J.) *Caesar: De Bello Gallico*. Ex traits. Pp. xxxi+125+60. Namur: Wesmael-Charlier, 1956. Paper, 79 B. fr.
- Schnayder* (J.) *De antiquorum hominum taciturnitate et tacendo*. (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wroclaw, Ser. A, Nr. 56.) Pp. 56. Wroclaw: Société des Sciences et des Lettres, 1956. Paper, zł. 8.50.
- Schwarz* (G. T.) *Philosophisches Lexicon zur griechischen Literatur*. Pp. 109. Bern: Francke, 1957. Stiff paper, 2.80 Sw. fr.
- Simonetti* (M.) *Pseudo-Athanasii De Trinitate*. Libri x-xii. Pp. 147. Bologna: Cappelli, 1956. Paper.
- Tabachovitz* (D.) *Die Septuaginta und das Neue Testament: Stilstudien*. (Skriften utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 80, iv.) Pp. 135. Lund: Gleerup, 1956. Paper, kr. 20.
- Thompson* (Stith) *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*. New enlarged and revised edition. Vol. 3 (F-H). Pp. 519. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1956. Cloth.
- Uttchenko* (S. L.) *Der weltanschaulich-politische Kampf in Rom am Vorabend des Sturzes der Republik*. (Übersetzung aus dem Russischen.) Pp. ix+240. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1956. Cloth, DM. 12.50.
- Valente* (M.) *L'éthique stoïcienne chez Cicéron*. Pp. 456. Paris: Librairie Saint-Paul, 1957. Paper, 2,850 fr.
- Valigiglio* (E.) *Silla e la crisi repubblicana*. Pp. viii+256. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1957. Paper, L. 1,000.
- Vermeule* (C. C.) *Cameo and Intaglio: Engraved Gems from the Sommerville Collection*. Pp. 32. Philadelphia: University Museum, 1956. Paper, 25 c.
- Vitucci* (G.) *Ricerche sulla Praefectura Urbi in età imperiale (sec. i-iii)*. Pp. 124. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider, 1956. Paper, L. 1,800.
- Vos* (H.) *Θέμυς*. Pp. 83. Assen, Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1957. Paper.
- Zafiropolo* (J.) *Diogène d'Apollonie*. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Pp. 207. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1956. Paper.

T
m
up
na
in
(d

an
of
Ch
Q
be
Gr

ye
6s
ca
po

M
ser
Ri
Sc
Di
Ca
Lo
lan
Sh
Sw

Short Reviews	158,
Correspondence	177
Summaries of Periodicals	181
Notes and News	184
Books Received	185

The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Peter Symonds' School, Winchester. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melluish, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

Greece and Isles of Greece Cruises

Reservations, tickets, etc., from representatives ASSOCIATION OF STEAMSHIP OWNERS OF GREECE maintaining services in the Mediterranean and isles of Greece and coastal ports

*Teachers and students 20% to
30% rebate*

MEMBERS:

HELLENIC MEDITERRANEAN LINES
TYPALDOS LINES * EPIROTIKY LINE
KAVOUNIDES LINE * FOUSTANOUS LINE
SIGALAS LINE * NOMIKOS LINES * JOHN
TOYAS LINES * NEW EPIROTIKY LINE
EVAN TOYAS LINE * DIAPOULIS LINE
LATSI LINE

Handbook to Greece— Turkey, Cyprus and Malta with Hellenic self-taught section

36 illustrations, plans and map, 12s. 6d.
plus postage 1s.
1s. 6d. Registered

The ideal companion-guide for intending
travellers. Most reasonably priced for
the wealth of information it contains
when compared to others.

Book through your travel agent or

OCEANWAYS STEAMSHIP AGENCY LTD.

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus, London, S.W. 1

Phones: TRAlgar 6055-56

Cables: Dakoglu

BOOKS ON

CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY BYZANTIUM AND THE MIDDLE AGES

Large and small collections bought, or individual items, e.g.: Critical Editions, indexes, monographs, Teubners, standard collections of texts, inscriptions, papyri, palaeography, M.G.H., the Latin Thesaurus, Evans's Palace of Minos and Scripta Minoa, B.M. Catalogues of Coins, books by J. F. Beazley, Bury, Farnell, Frazer, T. Frank, G. F. Hill, Bouché Leclercq, Cumont, Chalandon, Ch. Diehl, Kern Leo, Norden, Rostovtzeff, Wilamowitz, &c., &c.

W. HEFFER & SONS Ltd.

Petty Cury, Cambridge

Telephone: 58351

Telegrams: Heffer, Cambridge

Published by the Oxford University Press, Amen House, London, E.C. 4, and printed in Great Britain at the University Press, Oxford, by Charles Batey, Printer to the University